

This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/>



Royal finances in the period of baronial reform and rebellion, 1255-1270.

Collingwood, James Alexander

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works - You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**ROYAL FINANCE IN THE PERIOD OF BARONIAL REFORM
AND REBELLION, 1255-1270**

James Alexander Collingwood

King's College London

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the University of London

October 1995



Thesis Abstract

The objective of this thesis has been to examine the royal finances of King Henry III between the years 1255 to 1270 through making use of the surviving exchequer and chancery records from this period.

There have been two primary aims. The first of which has been to calculate the king's annual revenue and expenditure between 1255 and 1270 and to analyse both the sources from which the revenue was obtained and the purposes on which it was spent. The second aim has been to outline changes in the financial administration relating to the shires, concentrating particularly on terms upon which the sheriffs held office and the control that the exchequer exercised over these sheriffs. In this respect, particular emphasis has been placed on the years of baronial reform between 1258 to 1261 since the reforms initiated in this period highlight the grievances with and the failures of the king's financial administration in the years up to the mid 1250s.

Finally, it will be argued that the period 1255 to 1270 marks a major turning point in the finances of the English medieval monarchy. The traditional sources of revenue developed by the Angevins were no longer sufficient to adequately finance

the crown, whilst the level of receipts into both the wardrobe and exchequer were falling over the course of the first three quarters of the thirteenth century. This decrease in revenue is most notably seen in the final fifteen years of Henry's reign and provides the background for the changes in crown finance that were witnessed during the reign of Edward I.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Table of Contents	iii
Notes on References	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. 1255 to 1258: The Years Leading to Reform	27
3. The Sheriffs, the Exchequer and Baronial Reform, 1255-61	81
4. Reform and Finance, 1258-61	141
5. Henry's Regaining and Loss of Power, 1261-3	197
6. The Civil War, 1263-1267	233
7. The Aftermath of the Civil War, 1267-70	299
8. Conclusion	355
<i>Bibliography</i>	381

Abbreviations

<i>BIHR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</i>
<i>CChR</i>	<i>Calendar of Charter Rolls</i>
<i>CIM</i>	<i>Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous</i>
<i>CLR</i>	<i>Calendar of Liberate Rolls</i>
<i>CPR</i>	<i>Calendar of Patent Rolls</i>
<i>DBM</i>	<i>Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion</i> , ed. R.F. Treharne and I. J. Saunders (Oxford, 1973)
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>Thirteenth Century England I</i>	<i>Thirteenth Century England I: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference 1985</i> , ed. P. R. Coss and S. D. Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1986)
<i>TRHS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>

Chapter 1

Introduction

The years 1255 to 1272 were amongst the most dramatic in English Medieval History. They saw the collapse of the king's authority, followed by baronial attempts at a wide ranging reform of the legal system, royal finance and the government administration. They culminated in a civil war in which the royalist side was ultimately victorious. The importance of these years and events was two fold. Firstly, they were an indictment of Henry III's methods and means of government since, by 1258, Henry's form of personal rule was no longer effective enough to maintain political stability within England. Secondly, the reforms carried out by the opponents of the king and the changes in the crown's overall financial position during these years highlighted the need for a different approach to be taken by the monarchy to its revenue raising and expenditure programmes, these needs being reflected in the financial and administrative changes that occurred during the reign of Edward I.

The two themes to be addressed in this chapter are the methodology used in calculating royal revenue and expenditure for the tables contained in this thesis and the history and historiography of royal finances in the years up to 1258. The first

of these themes, methodology, consists of highlighting the financial evidence surviving from the 1250s and 1260s and the means by which it has been used to formulate tables recording the king's income and outgoings. The second theme, historiography, will revolve around noting what work has been done on the finances of the last years of Henry III's reign and providing, from secondary sources, a general overview of the financial state of the English monarchy in the first half of the thirteenth century.

The major documentary source for Henry III's income is the series of pipe rolls. These rolls were primarily the exchequer's record of the sheriffs' yearly account for the financial issues of their shires, but also included the accounts of officials looking after escheats, custodies, the exchange, ecclesiastical vacancies and other miscellaneous areas of royal revenue, these non-shire accounts being termed the foreign accounts. The pipe rolls recorded the cash paid into the exchequer and the credits given to officials against their debts, these credits being allowances for expenditure by local officials as authorised by the king.

The exchequer was not the only body through which the king received his income. A sizeable sum of money each year went into the king's wardrobe which had a separate administration to the exchequer. Local officials could be ordered to make a lump sum payment into the wardrobe instead of into the exchequer. Such sums were generally recorded on the shire and foreign accounts on the pipe rolls as credits to the officials in their accounts. Receipts into the wardrobe also came from other sources such as fines, gifts and gratuitous payments which went

unrecorded on the shire and foreign accounts. Usually the wardrobe accounts were enrolled on the pipe rolls, but, unfortunately, there is no such account between 30th April 1256 to 7th July 1258 which thus hinders a fuller picture of Henry's income being reached for the period 1255-1258.

Even when the wardrobe accounts were enrolled on them, the pipe rolls still do not give a complete view of Henry's financial position. Financial issues concerned with the English Jewry were kept at the separate Exchequer of the Jews, the records of which have been lost. Fortunately, as a source of cash to the king, money received from the Jews was minimal during most of the period 1255 to 1270 due to Henry assigning Jewish revenues to members of his family¹. The pipe rolls were limited to the king's English resources but Henry also ruled over land in Gascony and Ireland. The Irish accounts no longer exist and therefore Irish revenue cannot be calculated whilst Gascony, as in the 1240s, did not provide any net income for the king. In any case, both these territories had been granted by Henry to his son, Edward, Gascony having been given to Edward in September 1249², whilst Ireland was granted to him in February 1254³. The rights that Henry maintained in these areas do not seem, from available evidence, to have provided any cash income into the exchequer or wardrobe. Instead, such rights, such as Henry's control over vacant church lands, seem to have been used for patronage purposes.

¹The details of such grants will be noted in subsequent chapters.

²*CChR*, 1226-57, p. 345.

³*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 270.

Since the pipe rolls are continuous throughout the period 1255 to 1270, they will be used as the basis for providing an analysis of Henry's income. However, it must be pointed out that they were not designed to record the king's cash flow in each financial year. Rather, the pipe rolls reflect the workings of the upper exchequer whose administrative task was to audit the accounts of local officials. Cash flow, as determined by cash payments into the lower exchequer, was recorded on the receipt rolls. Two receipt rolls were drawn up in each financial year, one recording the daily income of the Easter term and the other one recording the daily income for the Michaelmas term⁴.

Unfortunately, their survival is patchy for the period of this thesis and hence they can only give a fragmentary idea of cash flow into the exchequer.

Correlating exactly the cash income received at the lower exchequer, as recorded on the receipt rolls, with the income audited on the pipe rolls as having been paid into the exchequer is extremely difficult, as more generally, is the attempt to estimate annual revenue from the pipe rolls. Nonetheless, since there is no other continuous source, the attempt is worth making and the results may be taken as broadly reflective of annual revenue, although not of the revenue for any precisely definable financial year. These problems arise from the way the exchequer carried

⁴Revenue continued to flow into the exchequer throughout most of the year. Thus, the Easter receipt roll also records payments into the exchequer during the Trinity term, whilst the Michaelmas receipt roll records payments made in the Hilary term.

out its annual audit⁵. The exchequer began hearing accounts in the Michaelmas term and went through to the following summer. It certainly had a sense that the accounts it was hearing were for the previous financial year, a year it labelled by the regnal year in which the bulk of that financial year fell. (Thus a sheriff was said to account for the year 42 Henry III, 43 Henry III and so forth). Historians have nearly always assumed that the financial year in question here ran from Michaelmas to Michaelmas. Thus the accounts which the exchequer heard from Michaelmas 1257 through to the summer of 1258 were for the financial year Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1257. In a sense this is right, especially in respect of the sheriff's farm which certainly was thought of as covering the period from Michaelmas to Michaelmas. (Hence if a sheriff was removed at the end of December he was responsible for a quarter year's portion of the farm and if at Easter for half a year). I have, therefore, spoken in this thesis of a financial year running from Michaelmas to Michaelmas and have labelled pipe rolls accordingly: the roll for 1255-6, 1256-7 and so forth. It would however be quite wrong to think that the revenue audited in any roll was the revenue which came in between Michaelmas and Michaelmas. This was because the exchequer, with some exceptions⁶, summoned the sheriffs and other collectors to pay in the revenue for the financial year at the lower

⁵The following discussion is based on my own examination of the pipe, receipt and memoranda rolls. For another discussion see D. A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990), pp. 109-112.

⁶Revenues from eyres were sometimes summoned to be paid in as soon as the eyre finished whatever the date.

exchequer in two stages, the first at the close of Easter and the second on the day after Michaelmas. (The appearance of the sheriffs, or their deputies, with the money on these days was recorded on the Memoranda Roll of the exchequer as well as on the receipt roll and was called the *Adventus Vicecomitum*). However, in practice, not all the money that the sheriffs and others were summoned to collect came in promptly either at the close of Easter or the day after Michaelmas. In particular, large if diminishing sums, came in all the way through between Michaelmas and Christmas. Indeed the exchequer was prepared to audit against the debts owed for any particular financial year, money paid in down to the actual date of the sheriff's account. Thus the pipe roll for what historians call the financial year 1256-7, that is the roll recording the accounts heard between Michaelmas 1257 and the summer of 1258 might record money paid in, in some counties, as late as the summer of 1258, the *terminus ad quem* varying in each county according to the date of the account. The roll would also have comparatively little money from the Michaelmas term of 1256, most of that being recorded on the previous pipe roll. Despite these problems, however, and with some further qualifications entered below, the rolls remain tolerably reflective of annual revenue. Fundamentally each roll will catch the great bulk of the revenue paid in at the start of each Easter and Michaelmas term and in the immediately ensuing months, in itself the great bulk of the revenue each year. Put another way, the roll recording the accounts heard between Michaelmas 1257 and the summer of 1258, does record the accounts for the financial year Michaelmas 1256 to 1257, but the great majority of the revenue of that year will have been paid in

between Easter and Christmas 1257. That should always be born in mind when consulting the tables in this thesis.

For the highest skill at the Exchequer does not lie in calculations, but in judgments of all kinds ⁷

The above quotation sums up the problems associated with determining the size of Henry's revenue and expenditure with any accuracy. Bearing in mind the complications mentioned previously, two types of revenue table have been drawn up. The first type of table simply records all the revenue audited on a pipe roll for the shire and foreign accounts and has been termed the actual revenue table. The second table used is the adjusted revenue table which takes account of the problems noted below.

Each year's pipe roll does not always record the account for every county for the period covered by that particular pipe roll. Thus one is presented with cases of a county account being for two or more years. When faced with this, for the calculation of the adjusted revenue table, the revenue from each category has been divided up according to the number of years such an account covers. For example, the Cumberland account in the Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1257 pipe roll is for the two year period Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1257, and a total demesne revenue of £454 14s 6d has been recorded for that

⁷R. FitzNigel, *Dialogus de Scaccario De Necessariis Observantiis Scaccarii Dialogus qui vulgo dicitur Dialogus de Scaccario*, ed. and trans. by C. Johnson (Oxford, 1983), p. 15.

account⁸. This figure has been divided by two and sums of £227 7s 3d have been assigned to both the Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1256 and to the Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1257 financial years for demesne revenue for this county. However, three liberties have been taken concerning this particular problem of accounts covering two or more years. The first concerns the county farms and increments (which have been termed shire issues in the tables) that the sheriffs accounted for. In those cases of a two year account but with different sheriffs rendering for each year, the revenue recorded as being paid in by each sheriff is placed in the year of his shrieval tenure. For example, the Bedfordshire/ Buckinghamshire account on the Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1260 pipe roll covers the two years Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1260 with Simon de Patteshull accounting for the Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 financial year and Alexander de Hamden accounting for the subsequent year⁹. Shire issue revenue paid by Simon has been placed in the Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 revenue table with Alexander's payments placed in the Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1260 revenue table. The second exception concerns judicial revenue received from the eyres. This has been placed in the years during and after an eyre. The Yorkshire account on the Michaelmas 1257 to Michaelmas 1258 pipe roll is for that financial year and the two previous years¹⁰. The majority of judicial revenue in the accounts came from the eyre held in the

⁸E. 372/101, m. 35-6.

⁹E. 372/104, m. 23d.

¹⁰E. 372/102, m. 37-40.

county during the course of 1257. This eyre revenue has been divided between the 1256-7 and 1257-8 financial years with nothing placed in the 1255-6 year (since this latter year ended before the eyre got under way). The outstanding judicial revenue, whether from previous eyres or from non-eyre amercements, has been divided equally between the three years¹¹. Similarly, this has been done for taxation where yearly receipts from tax grants might be distorted by such joint accounts.

A similar problem to the above occurs in dealing with the miscellaneous accounts. The officials dealing with ecclesiastical vacancies, escheats, mint issues etc. did not have their accounts audited on the basis of each financial year, i.e. the dates of their accounts did not coincide with the Michaelmas dates of the pipe roll financial years. For example, Robert Walerand was responsible for the issues of the bishopric of Ely during its vacancy and rendered account on the Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1257 pipe roll for the period 29th October 1256 to the 15th January 1258, paying £1202 6s 8d into the exchequer and wardrobe¹². As with the methodology for the shire accounts, this sum has been divided up according to how long this account coincided with the respective financial years 1256-7 and 1257-8 and sums allocated accordingly, i.e. £912 2s 4d to 1256-7 and £290 4s 4d to 1257-8. This process has been extended to all such foreign accounts. Where dates have not been given for the account, it has been

¹¹D. Crook, *Records of the General Eyre*, (PRO Handbooks 20, 1982). Crook's book has been used to determine the dates during which the justices were on eyre.

¹²E. 372/101,m.8.

assumed that the account was for a period within the financial year covered by the pipe roll.

The pipe roll revenue has been categorised into two sections: the first containing audited income from the shire accounts; the second comprising audited income from the foreign accounts. The shire account tables are divided into nine categories of revenue. The first of these, shire issues, records the income paid by the county sheriffs from the issues of the traditional county farm and fixed increments. The demesne category consists primarily of the farms of the royal manors and boroughs which were not included within the county farm along with any rents of royal land, crop sales and payments by guilds. The judicial section records the payments out of the general eyre (which make up the bulk of the income received for this category) and fines made with the king for various legal rights, such as the grant of charters to boroughs, exemptions from legal service, payments for having a writ or any other legal favour. Payments labelled on the pipe rolls as being for debts, i.e. money still due to the exchequer from previous years' accounts, are contained in the debts category. All income received from the Jews, whether it was debts owed to the king, fines for legal rights or taxation are placed in the Jewish category. Feudal income contains the issues from the king's traditional feudal rights, i.e. custody rights over minors, the marriage of heiresses, payments for relief and escheats and seisins of land. These rights were usually sold off by the king in return for a fixed fine, or, alternatively, were granted out by the king for patronage purposes. The taxation category consists of the income received from the various taxation rights of the crown such as scutage, tallage and aids. The forest section notes the income

generated by royal rights over the forest, though some of this revenue has been categorised elsewhere, as will be commented upon below. The final area of income, miscellaneous, contains that revenue which cannot be attributed to the above eight categories.

The foreign accounts are divided into six categories of revenue. The first, ecclesiastical vacancies, records the income received from vacant church lands, i.e. revenue received from bishoprics, abbeys and other church lands following the death of a bishop or abbot and prior to the selection of a successor. The demesne, forest and miscellaneous categories cover the same type of revenue as recorded for the shire accounts. The escheats/seisins category notes the income generated by these particular rights, with most of this income coming from the two accounts of the escheators north and south of the Trent. The sixth foreign account category records the income provided by the mints at London and Canterbury and is contained under the mint/exchange heading.

As regards this categorisation of revenue, the revenue figures for each category are only approximate in that it is not always clear what category a particular cash payment should be placed into. For example, it was common for a lump sum payment to have been made into either the exchequer or wardrobe for dues arising from a variety of sources of revenue. Such cases have been placed into the 'debts' category in the tables. In determining forest revenue figures, all judicial payments pertaining to forest pleas and rights associated with the forest, such as pannage, have been placed in the 'forest category', whilst farms, rents and assarts have gone into the 'demesne' section. In the entries where the payment by the official was in excess of the sum demanded, the resultant

surplus has been included in the category for the initial due and not where the surplus was used to cover other summons. This has been done for simplicity since surpluses were often transferred from one year's roll to the following years' rolls and keeping track of such cases is difficult. However, any discrepancies affecting individual categories of revenue from these cases are small. The only figure that can be calculated with any accuracy is the total revenue contained and accounted for on a pipe roll.

In general, the adjusted revenue table has been used in comparing the size of the king's income from one year (or period) to another year (or period). This has been done since this table gives a better idea of what royal financial resources were generated in any one year than the actual revenue table does, as it takes account of delayed audits. Taking the case of Buckingham/ Bedford as an example, the sheriff Robert de Totehale accounted on the Michaelmas 1257 to Michaelmas 1258 pipe roll for the two years Michaelmas 1256-57 and Michaelmas 1257-58¹³. The actual revenue table places all revenue for Buckingham/ Bedford from this Michaelmas 1257-58 pipe roll in the financial year Michaelmas 1257-58 and nothing in the Michaelmas 1256-57 year. However, revenue was being received by the exchequer from Buckingham/ Bedford during the Michaelmas 1256-57 year since the receipt roll for the Easter 1257 term records both Robert de Totehale and the representatives of the town of Bedford as paying cash into the exchequer¹⁴. Thus, the adjusted revenue table, which splits the revenue received from Buckingham/

¹³E. 372/102,m.11.

¹⁴E. 401/30, m. 1, 2, 3.

Bedford between both the years Michaelmas 1256-57 and Michaelmas 1257-58, provides for a more accurate figure for revenue received per year from these counties than the actual revenue table does.

This methodology does suffer from one drawback in that it assumes that, for accounts covering more than two years, cash was being paid into the exchequer or wardrobe throughout the period covered by the account and not just as a lump sum when the account was heard. However, whilst this is not a problem for most of the years covered by this thesis, when sheriffs or their deputies were appearing fairly regularly at the lower exchequer with money, it is likely that the adjusted revenue tables for the period of the civil war and its immediate aftermath do suffer from distortions from this methodology since many shire accounts were covering periods of three or more years, during which sheriffs often made intermittent appearances at the exchequer. The problem of these prolonged shire account audits will be more adequately covered in later chapters. However, in general, it seems fair to claim that the adjusted revenue tables provide the most adequate calculation as regards the king's annual revenue.

The tables outlining the king's income comprise five sections for each year. The first two record cash income audited on the shire and foreign accounts as having been paid into the exchequer and wardrobe. The third section notes any miscellaneous receipts that are not noted on the pipe rolls but can be determined from other sources to have been received by the exchequer. For example, the Easter 1260 receipt roll records the payment of £327 19s 7d for a tallage on the Jews which has gone

unrecorded on the pipe rolls¹⁵. The fourth section records, where possible, any wardrobe receipts for that year that have gone unrecorded in the first two sections. The figures for this section are based on determining what receipts noted in the wardrobe accounts went unaccounted on the shire and foreign accounts. These resultant receipts are then allocated to the appropriate financial year where possible. Since the wardrobe accounts were usually for periods of two years or over, properly allocating these miscellaneous receipts is very difficult. Such receipts have been allocated to the year in which they were paid when a date has been given. However, the dates on which receipts were paid into the wardrobe are rarely mentioned and therefore such undated miscellaneous receipts have been divided up equally for each year of the account.

The sum of these four sections gives the cash revenues of the king for that particular year. The final section consists of the credits on the pipe rolls for expenditure by officials as authorised by the king. These have been added to the cash revenue to give a figure for the king's total notional income for the year. This has been done to give an idea of the approximate total of the financial resources available to the crown in that year. Since the amount of money spent on a local level could fluctuate wildly, hence affecting the amount of cash that could be paid over to the exchequer or wardrobe, ignoring such credits would give a false picture of the amount of revenue that was called upon by the crown and exchequer. Despite these efforts to gain a figure for yearly royal revenue, the sums quoted must be treated as

¹⁵E. 401/42, m. 10.

approximate estimates since the number of sums involved and the complexity of accounting processes conspire to prevent a definite figure for annual revenue being reached in full¹⁶.

The records for Henry's expenditure are not as complete as those for his revenue. The major documentary sources for this area are the *Liberate Rolls* which record writs issued by the king, or one of his senior officials, commanding expenditure to be made on his behalf. These were in the form of three types of writ: *liberate* writs were authorisations to the exchequer to pay out money to the recipient of such a writ; *contrabreve* writs were orders to the king's officials in the localities to spend money, with the promise of an appropriate credit to the official when his account was heard at the exchequer; and *allocate* writs by which the exchequer was ordered to give a credit to an official for his expenditure out of royal revenue¹⁷. However, the *Liberate Rolls* are not fully complete for all the years of the period of this thesis, which thus hinders a full picture of the expenditure by the king being reached. In addition to this problem, the *Liberate Rolls* were essentially a record of expenditure authorised by the king and hence they do not record whether the writs issued were acted upon by the local officials or the exchequer. In theory, *liberate*

¹⁶D. A. Carpenter, *Minority*, p. 413; R. C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy and Finance under Henry III 1216-1245* (Oxford, 1987), p. 201. Both Carpenter and Stacey in their calculations of Henry's revenue at the start of the reign and then in the 1240s point out the problems associated with determining income levels but regard the exercise as worthwhile.

¹⁷*CLR, 1226-1240*, pp. v-xiii.

writs should correspond with the entries in the issue rolls, which record the actual payments of money out of the exchequer, whilst *contrabreve* and *allocate* writs should correspond with the credit allowances given to local officials in their accounts audited at the exchequer. However, in practice, this did not occur. Not all *liberate* writs issued were honoured at the exchequer, whilst *contrabreve* writs were not necessarily carried out by the officials receiving them. In addition, even if writs were honoured, they were not always paid out at the time, or rather in the same financial year, when the initial writ was issued, i.e. a *liberate* writ issued in the summer of 1256 during the financial year Michaelmas 1255-56 might not be paid out until the Michaelmas 1256 exchequer opened in September/ October 1256 for the Michaelmas 1256-57 financial year. Therefore, as a record of expenditure, the *Liberate Rolls* can only give very approximate totals for the king's outgoings.

The issue rolls, unfortunately, are far from complete, only surviving in full for the financial years Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1259, and hence conclusions to the extent of royal expenditure dealt with by the exchequer involves a great deal of guesswork. Similarly, there are problems associated with expenditure through the king's wardrobe since, as stated before, the accounts of the wardrobe are missing for two years. Therefore, in determining annual expenditure by the king, the total of *liberate* writs enrolled on the *Liberate Rolls* has been used for exchequer expenditure, with the allowances on the pipe rolls being used for sums disbursed by local officials. This is far from satisfactory but it is the nearest way of getting a rough idea of royal outgoings. However, perhaps it should be stated that any

deficiencies in these expenditure totals and their associated application to the overall view of royal finance can be overcome. By this it is meant that, since ultimately the king's expenditure was determined by his revenue, a drop in royal revenue should be followed by a fall in expenditure¹⁸. A failure to do so would have meant the king taking out loans which should be recorded on the chancery rolls.

The expenditure tables for the *Liberate Rolls* and for pipe roll credits have been divided into nine categories for each table. Eight categories are common to both the tables and are as follows: alms notes the king's charitable giving to the poor and religious foundations; wages earned in the royal service and maintenance payments to individuals are contained in the wages/maintenance category; the king's monetary presents make up the royal gift section; the costs of construction and repair of royal buildings are noted in the building works category; the purchases/munitions section records money spent on food, clothing and other basic necessities by both the royal household and by castle garrisons employed by the king; annual fee payments are noted in the fee category; the administration/expenses category consists of the money spent on royal business by the king's employees; whilst miscellaneous comprises any other expenditure. The ninth category for the *Liberate Rolls*

¹⁸R. J. Whitwell, 'The revenue and expenditure of England under Henry III', *EHR*, xviii (1903), pp. 710-11. It is noticeable that both the Michaelmas 1253 and Easter 1254 issue and receipt roll figures have total incomings and outgoings of over £25,000, but the Michaelmas 1256-57 and Michaelmas 1257-58 totals for both sets of rolls drop to £12-13,000 per year.

notes the money ordered to be transferred from the exchequer to the wardrobe. This category has been omitted from the pipe roll credit tables since such allowances have been recorded in the income tables. Instead, the ninth category for pipe roll credits notes the value of pardons recorded in the shire and foreign accounts. These pardons were grants to people letting them off money that they owed to the king. Although this category is not expenditure as such, it has been included for the purposes of working out the total notional income available to the king in any year. Since the pipe roll credits are contained within the total notional income figures, it seems misleading to ignore potential revenue available to the king but which he choose not to collect.

As with the categorisation of revenue, there are a few problems associated with getting a breakdown of the areas to which royal expenditure was going. Not all the writs issued give a definite total of money to be spent, i.e. cases where a writ states a sum per day for wages is to be paid out for a set period of time. In these circumstances, I have multiplied the sum per day by the number of days of the specified period for the total wage paid out. The most notable difficulty concerns payments to keepers of the royal castles. Large sums of money were often allocated to these keepers without a clear explanation of what the money was being spent on, i.e. whether it was for the maintenance of soldiers or for the purchase of castle munitions or as a fee for the keeper of the castle. Again, in such cases I have used my discretion in deciding what category to allocate such payments.

An additional problem is that the expenditure figures contained in the *Liberate Rolls* are for each regnal year, that is from 28 October to 27 October. The expenditure listed for each regnal year has thus no relevance to any 'financial year' (which started at the end of September at Michaelmas). Therefore, I have considered it best to split the income in the *Liberate Rolls* and give tables of such expenditure for the financial year from Michaelmas to Michaelmas. As an example, the Michaelmas 1255-56 figures combine the expenditure writs issued in the last month of regnal year October 1254 to October 1255 and the first eleven months of regnal year October 1255 to October 1256.

Both sets of revenue and expenditure tables essentially record the king's ordinary income and outgoings, i.e. the income pertaining to the crown from the royal demesne, judicial issues, Jews, feudal rights, the exchanges and the forest and the expenditure out of these sources and the lower exchequer. Extraordinary income, in the form of general taxation grants were not recorded on the pipe rolls and go unnoted in the tables (aside from the exception noted below) as does the expenditure out of the issues of this form of income. The two general taxation grants of this period were both levied only on the church. The first one, in the 1250s, went towards funding the king's Sicilian ambitions and its proceeds were not paid over to the exchequer nor to the wardrobe nor were used to cover the king's domestic expenditure requirements. The second grant was in the late 1260s and did provide some cash revenue for the king, which was paid into the wardrobe, though the bulk of the proceeds went towards covering the king's outstanding debts. The totals of both these sets of taxation grants have been

recorded separately to the financial tables in the appropriate chapters.

No full scale attempt has hitherto been made at examining Henry III's finances and financial administration during the years 1255 to 1272, though aspects of these areas have previously been examined. S. K. Mitchell and W. E. Lunt have recorded and commented upon the use of both lay and clerical taxation during this period in their studies of English medieval taxation¹⁹, whilst D. A. Carpenter has highlighted Henry's ability in the 1250s to save two gold treasures, the latter one with the intended use of financing his proposed Sicilian crusade²⁰. Areas of financial administration have attracted more attention, in particular the administration of the shrieval office in the localities with D. A. Carpenter and J. R. Maddicott noting the changes in the nature of the shrieval office and the problems of local administration up to 1258-59²¹. W. A. Morris, in his study of the office of the English sheriff up to 1300, has commented upon the difference in the shrieval office between 1216 and the end of

¹⁹S. K. Mitchell, *Taxation in Medieval England*, (Yale, 1951); S. K. Mitchell, *Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III*, (Yale, 1914); W. E. Lunt, *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1939).

²⁰D. A. Carpenter, 'The gold treasure of King Henry III', *Thirteenth Century England I*, pp.61-88.

²¹D. A. Carpenter, 'The Decline of the curial sheriff in England', *EHR*, xci (1976), pp.1-32; J. Maddicott, 'Magna Carta and the local community 1215-1259', *Past and Present*, cii (Feb. 1984), pp. 25-26.

Edward I's reign in 1307. By the latter date, the sheriff was no longer so much the personal servant of the monarch but the holder of an office subjected in general to fixed rules and forms, with the holders of the office tending to be members of local knightly families rather than great officers of state as had once been the situation²². In addition, T. F. Tout has examined the development of royal administration during the medieval period, commenting upon the use of the seals and wardrobe for the period of this thesis²³.

There have only been two attempts made to show changes in royal income over these years. M. H. Mills has recorded the receipts into the lower exchequer for the two yearly proffers by the county sheriffs, the *Adventi Vicecomitum*, from the issues of their shires and also noted the shrieval attendance at the exchequer of audit²⁴. The work of M. H. Mills demonstrates the disruption in the relationship between the sheriffs and the exchequer caused by the civil war, but it falls short of giving an adequate view of the king's income for the 1255 to 1270 period. As has been noted, only a proportion of the money collected by the sheriffs and others came in on the actual day of the *Adventus*, so Mills' figures give a very incomplete picture of royal income. The nearest attempt made at estimating Henry III's income was

²²W. A. Morris, *The Medieval English Sheriff to 1300* (Manchester, 1927), p. 167.

²³T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, vol. 1 (Manchester, 1967), pp. 278-317.

²⁴M. H. Mills, "'Adventus Vicecomitum', 1258-72", *EHR*, xxxvi (1921), pp. 481-496.

made by J. H. Ramsay²⁵. Ramsay gave approximate totals for the king's cash income, though, unfortunately, the totals that he records for Henry's reign are hindered through his incorrect use of the exchequer pipe rolls. Due to a mistake at the start of Henry's reign, Ramsay used the incorrect pipe rolls for each financial year, attributing the revenue for each pipe roll to the year after the actual year the pipe roll was audited for, i.e. the exchequer receipts he gives for Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1256 make use of the pipe roll for the preceding year, Michaelmas 1254 to Michaelmas 1255²⁶. Even if Ramsay's mistake is corrected, i.e. attributing the pipe roll figures he quotes to the correct year, the yearly totals for revenue that he came up with still differ considerably in certain years to the totals that have been calculated in this thesis. This is because Ramsay seems to have used a lot of guesswork and made many assumptions about the king's income which do not seem to be justified. Therefore, the revenue totals that Ramsay assigns to Henry III are essentially incorrect and can be ignored in any analysis.

Before starting to analyse the financial changes between 1255 to 1270, this period must be placed within the context of the financial position of the English monarchy in the thirteenth century. Comparing royal income from one period to another is always subject to distortions which can be difficult to quantify precisely. For example, inflation over the thirteenth century undermines a comparison of total revenue at the end of

²⁵J. H. Ramsay, *A History of the Revenues of the Kings of England 1066-1399* (Oxford, 1925), vol. 1.

²⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 319-21.

the century as compared to the total revenue at the beginning of the century, whilst financial records are more complete for certain periods of the century as compared to others. However, sufficient research work has been done in order to provide the basis for a limited picture of the finances of Henry III in the years up to the 1250s.

Work recently done by D. A. Carpenter and N. Barratt has provided figures for pipe roll income for the latter years of John's reign and the minority period of Henry III²⁷. For the years just prior to the civil war at the end of John's reign, N. Barratt has quoted figures of £83,291, £56,612 and £25,712 for the crown's total notional income audited on the pipe rolls for the years 1211, 1212 and 1214²⁸. Cash receipts for the years following John's death do not approach the totals for 1211 and 1212, reflecting the collapse of royal finances during the civil war. N. Barratt's figures for the years 1215 to 1220 recording a low of approximately £850 for 1215 and a high of just over £8130 for 1219. Even by the mid 1220s, annual income recorded on the pipe rolls still fell along way short of the 1211 figure, a total revenue sum of £14,000 being recorded by D. Carpenter for 1225²⁹. Given John's efforts at deriving as much money as possible from his resources, the 1211

²⁷D. A. Carpenter, *Minority*, pp. 413-417; N. Barratt, forthcoming London University PhD thesis.

²⁸Barratt reckons that John's revenue figures for the years 1211 and 1212 are actually higher with another £15,500 being raised by John as a result of the Interdict. This would bring John's income for 1211 and 1212 up to £98,791 and £72,112 respectively.

²⁹Carpenter, *Minority*, p. 413.

figure can be seen as being abnormally high and not a good example of average annual revenue that a twelfth or thirteenth century English monarch could expect from his financial resources. The giving of an approximate annual average for 'ordinary' royal income, i.e. excluding taxation grants, is risky since it is difficult to determine what was an 'average' year. However, of note pertaining to this, are two figures for pipe roll revenue calculated by N. Barratt for the two years 1130 and 1230. He records annual total notional income in both cases of £23,600 and £24,740 respectively³⁰. Since Ramsay records annual revenue figures in the range £15,000 to £25,000 for the reigns of Henry II and Richard I, it is probably fair to say that a figure of around £24,000 a year represents average annual revenue for the English monarchy for the mid twelfth to early thirteenth century.

As from the 1230s, it appears that Henry III's income increased. R. C. Stacey has recorded detailed figures for royal income for the years 1240-1 to 1244-5 which are of particular note in the financial history of Henry III's reign³¹. He records an average annual cash income for these years of approximately £31,500 a year and an average total notional income of approximately £42,000 a year. These figures represent a sizeable increase over the figures that have been calculated in this thesis for the 1250s and 1260s, suggesting that both Henry's cash and

³⁰This figure for 1130 is also borne out by J. A. Green's study of the 1129-30 pipe roll, in which just under £23,000 is recorded as having been paid over to Henry I; J. A. Green, 'Praeclarum et Magnificum Antiquitatis Monumentum': the Earliest Surviving Pipe Roll', *BIHR*, lv (1982), pp. 3, 16.

³¹R. C. Stacey, *Politics*, pp. 208-210.

total notional income reached a peak in the early 1240s for his reign.

One of the economic themes that has been widely addressed for the thirteenth century has been the rise in prices. The period 1180-1220 had seen a rapid increase in inflation, with the prices for oxen, ewes, cows and wheat all doubling at least in value between the 1160s and the first decade of the thirteenth century³². The upward trend in prices after 1220 was then more gradual following this initial burst³³. This rise in prices implies that the real value of the crown's income was being undermined. Thus, with the average yearly notional income figures that Barratt has calculated for 1130 and 1230 being approximately equal, the real value of the crown's income had decreased over the second half of the twelfth and early part of the thirteenth centuries. On the eve of the 1258 revolution, Henry's notional income was in the region of £27,500 a year³⁴, and when this is compared with Barratt's figures for 1130 and 1230, it would suggest that, whilst Henry's income was very slightly higher in money terms, the crown's income had not risen at the same pace as inflation.

In summing up, the situation for crown finances by the mid 1250s was one where income had declined from the early

³²P. D. A. Harvey, 'The English Inflation of 1180-1220', *Past and Present* November 1973, lxi, pp. 3-4; E. Miller and J. Hatcher, *Medieval England: Rural Society and Economic Change 1086-1348* (London, 1978), p. 67; J. L. Bolton, *The Medieval English Economy 1150-1500* (London), p. 76.

³³Bolton, *The Medieval English Economy*, pp. 68, 72, 76; Miller and Hatcher, *Medieval England*, pp. 66, 68.

³⁴See next chapter for details.

1240s. The overall long term trend of royal revenue was unfavourable with only a modest increase for the 1250s for total revenue as compared with the figures from the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and even then this increase was undermined through the effects of inflation. The time was thus approaching when a major rethink of the way in which the crown financed itself was needed. The beginnings of this change in attitude towards royal finance are to be seen in the years covering the period of this thesis.

Chapter 2

1255 to 1258: The Years Leading to Reform

The period leading up to the political revolution of 1258 appears to have been a time of financial problems for Henry III as he struggled to balance his revenue resources with his expenditure and proposed Sicilian crusading ambitions. Henry was simply not able to generate the resources he needed to fully cover the obligations that he had undertaken to fulfil. It will be argued here that Henry's inability to raise these resources created an unstable financial situation for the crown, which was ultimately to lead to the political events of 1258 and the resultant reform movement with its demands for, not only political reform, but financial reform as well.

Financial grievances were not the spark that ignited a section of the nobility into opposing Henry III in April 1258. D. A. Carpenter has made it clear that Henry's capitulation in 1258 was brought about by an armed demonstration of magnates at the Westminster 1258 April parliament, who were protesting about the issue of the Lusignans. It was not caused, as argued by Treharne, by Henry accepting reform in return for a grant of a financial aid for his Sicilian ambitions, through which Henry hoped

to avoid papal excommunication and interdict¹. Thus, Henry's financial problems and policies were not the immediate cause of the 1258 revolution. However, the circumstances that contributed to that situation arising can be seen to have stemmed from the financial and patronage demands that Henry had placed himself under. In analysing these underlying circumstances, three main areas are going to be examined: Henry's income and from where it was derived in the years 1255-58; the areas to which his expenditure was being directed; and finally the demands of patronage with its effect on both of the two previously mentioned areas.

The tables listed below reflect the actual and adjusted figures for the king's revenue as revealed by the pipe rolls for the years Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258:-

Adjusted			
	Mich. 1255-56	Mich. 1256-57	Mich. 1257-58
Shire Accounts	£13280	£16053	£12061
Foreign Accounts	£2697	£1871	£642
Wardrobe (not accounted above)	£588	-	£704
Miscellaneous Income	-	-	£2933

¹D. A. Carpenter, 'What Happened in 1258?', *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J. O. Prestwich*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Woodbridge, 1984), p. 106-19; R. F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform 1258-63* (Manchester, 1932), p. 62-66.

Total Cash Income	£16565	£17924	£16340
Credits	£11945	£10182	£9668
Total Notional Income	£28,510	£28,106	£26,008

Actual

	Mich. 1255-56	Mich. 1256-57	Mich. 1257-58
Shire Account	£13116	£14481	£12599
Foreign Account	£2301	£3374	£835
Wardrobe (not accounted above)	£588	-	£704
Miscellaneous	-	-	£2933
Total Cash Income	£16005	£17855	£17071
Credits	£11728	£10362	£9112
Total Notional Income	£27,733	£28,217	£26,183

Expenditure credits have been included in these tables in order to give an idea of what the king's total expendable income was each year. For example, using the adjusted table and taking the Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1257 year, the pipe rolls reveal that the king received £17,924 in cash and that £10,182 of his financial issues were spent locally by officials, hence giving Henry a potential £28,106 raised in this year.

What appears to have happened is that Henry's income in the mid 1250s had undergone a marked change as compared to the early 1240s with both Henry's cash receipts and total notional income dropping quite drastically. R. C. Stacey, in his study of Henry's finances in the first half of the 1240s, records equivalent figures for cash income for the period 1240 to 1245 varying from a low of £26,535 10s in 1243-4 to a high of £46,242 6s in 1241-

22. The equivalent totals for the years Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258 fall some way beneath the figures for the 1240s. An average cash income in the 1240s of £31,500 had fallen to one of approximately £17,000 by the mid 1250s³. However, it must be noted that the figures for the 1250s are not complete as regards the wardrobe receipts that were not accounted for through the exchequer, whilst those for the 1240s are (with the exception of 1240-1)⁴. Other than 1241-2, when such wardrobe receipts totalled £5238 3s, these amounts were relatively small for the early 1240s, averaging just under £500 a year⁵. Whether this low figure for wardrobe receipts not accounted for through the exchequer was still the case in the mid 1250s cannot be determined. However, it is extremely unlikely that the difference between the figures for cash income for the two periods can be explained along the lines of unaccounted wardrobe receipts.

Similarly, Henry's total notional income, as derived from the pipe rolls, shows a fall between the two periods. Stacey's figures for total notional income average out at just over £42,000 a year⁶, whilst those for 1255-58 average out at just over £27,500 a year. It must be pointed out here that Stacey's methodology for

²R. C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy and Finance 1216-1245* (Oxford 1987), p. 208.

³In comparing the revenue from the 1250s with Stacey's figures for the 1240s, I have used the adjusted table for revenue as that appears to be the methodology used by Stacey.

⁴This discrepancy for the wardrobe figures for the mid 1250s is caused by the missing wardrobe accounts for 30 April 1256 to 7 July 1258.

⁵Stacey, *Politics*, p. 210.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 208.

calculating total notional income differs slightly to that used for this thesis. In his total notional income figures, Stacey includes fixed credits in the *corpus comitatum*, which he states as consisting of fixed alms, fees, wages and in allowances for terris datis⁷. The credit (allowance) figures in this thesis contain those for fixed alms, fees and wages from the *corpus comitatum* but not those for terris datis. Thus, the £14,500 difference for total notional income between the 1240s and the mid 1250s, as noted above, overstates the difference in revenue available to the king between these two periods. However, it is still apparent that Henry's revenue had declined between these two periods. Stacey has deducted the fixed credits in the *corpus comitatum* to come up with figures for total expendable income, consisting of cash income and expenditure credits outside the *corpus*. These figures average out at £36,447 for the 1240s and are still some £9,000 per annum higher than the total notional income figures for the mid 1250s quoted here⁸.

It appears quite clearly that Henry's revenue had been

⁷Ibid., pp. 207-9.

⁸Ibid., p. 208. I have left out the terris datis figures from the corpus comitatum in the compilation of the credit tables for two reasons. The first is that some of these allowances were for land that the county sheriffs no longer accounted for at the exchequer. Instead these lands were accounted for by other bailiffs or local officials elsewhere in the shire accounts and thus to include these particular terris datis allowances would result in potential income to the crown being double counted. The second reason is that other lands recorded in the terris datis section had been given away by the crown and hence no money was being received at all from them.

falling from the mid 1240s to the mid 1250s and thus, in determining the reasons behind this fall, an analysis of the sources of revenue being paid to the crown is needed. Three tables are listed below which highlight these sources, the first two are the actual and adjusted tables for cash income as audited on the pipe rolls, whilst the third table categorises the receipts paid into the lower exchequer, as recorded on the receipt rolls. There are no receipt rolls for Michaelmas 1255 and Easter 1256, the surviving rolls are only complete for the period Michaelmas 1256 to Easter 1260. The Easter 1257 and Michaelmas 1257 receipt rolls have been added together to get the totals for 1257, which corresponds with the period in which the receipts on the Michaelmas 1256-Michaelmas 1257 pipe roll would mostly have been paid into the exchequer and wardrobe. Likewise, the Easter 1258 and Michaelmas 1258 receipt rolls have been added together to reach figures corresponding with the Michaelmas 1257 to Michaelmas 1258 pipe roll.

Adjusted Cash Income

	Mich. 1255-56	Mich. 1256-57	Mich. 1257-58
<u>Shire Accounts</u>			
Shire Issues	£1102	£1105	£1235
Demesne	£4395	£5106	£5260
Judicial	£3866	£6782	£2331
Debts	£1470	£1344	£1834
Jews	£31	£69	£58
Feudal	£605	£515	£293
Taxation	£807	£541	£709
Forest	£478	£307	£277

Miscellaneous	£526	£285	£64
Total Shire Accounts	£13,280	£16,053	£12,061
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>			
Ecclesiast. Vacancies	£1462	£1208	£364
Demesne Issues	£241	£25	£12
Forest	£320	£11	£5
Mint/Exchange	£568	£468	£97
Miscellaneous	-	-	-
Escheats/Seisins	£106	£159	£164
Total Foreign Account	£2697	£1871	£642
OVERALL TOTAL	£15,977	£17,924	£12,704

Actual Cash Income

	Mich. 1255-6	Mich. 1256-7	Mich. 1257-8
<u>Shire Accounts</u>			
Shire Issues	£1182	£821	£1380
Demesne	£4156	£4175	£5623
Judicial	£3506	£6757	£2556
Debts	£1585	£1146	£1528
Jews	£23	£56	£68
Feudal	£605	£513	£255
Taxation	£1014	£485	£743
Forest	£496	£250	£370
Miscellaneous	£549	£278	£76
Total Shire Accounts	£13,116	£14,481	£12,599
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>			
Ecclesiast. Vacancies	£312	£3363	£12
Demesne Issues	£130	£10	£206
Forest	£390	-	-

Mint/Exchange	£1468	-	£203
Miscellaneous	-	£1	-
Escheats/Seisins	-	-	£414
Total Foreign Account	£2301	£3374	£835
OVERALL TOTAL	£15,417	£17,855	£13,434

Receipt Roll Income

	Easter and Mich. 1257 ⁹	Easter and Mich. 1258 ¹⁰
Sheriffs	£4603	£3299
Demesne	£4976	£4441
Judicial	£1189	£869
Debts	£1134	£755
Jews	£63	£40
Feudal	£226	£115
Taxation	£60	£194
Forest	£57	£29
Miscellaneous	£1821	£3783
	£14,129	£13,525

Unfortunately, as is apparent from the above tables, it is difficult to compare the categorisation of revenue contained in the receipt roll tables with those contained in the pipe roll tables. The major reason for this is that, in the receipt rolls, the cash paid into the exchequer by the sheriff was treated as a lump sum payment with only occasional references to the source of the cash.

⁹E. 401/30,33.

¹⁰E.401/36,39.

Therefore, the figures for non-demesne categories of income are much lower than on the pipe rolls. The large figures for miscellaneous income in the receipt roll table are due to the inclusion of categories of revenue that would be included in the foreign accounts on the pipe rolls.

Since it is difficult to get an accurate comparison of the categories of revenue, the only table worth comparing is the total cash revenue on the receipt rolls with the total cash audited on the pipe rolls. A direct comparison with the pipe roll figures quoted above for cash income cannot be made since the figures also contain cash paid into the wardrobe as audited on the pipe rolls, whilst the receipt rolls only record cash paid into the exchequer. Deducting from the adjusted pipe roll figures for 1256-7 and 1257-8, the amount of money recorded on the pipe rolls as being paid into the wardrobe, figures for exchequer cash receipts of £14,163 for Michaelmas 1256-57 and £10,860 for Michaelmas 1257-8 are reached. The 1256-57 pipe roll figure for exchequer cash is thus approximately equal to the amount recorded on the receipt rolls for the same time. The discrepancy for the Michaelmas 1257-58 pipe roll for exchequer cash with the receipt rolls for the same period is explained by the £2933 6s 8d from the issues of the vacant Winchester bishopric. This sum is noted on the Michaelmas 1258 receipt roll as having been paid into the lower exchequer by the Hampshire sheriff, James le Sauvage, yet there is no record of this payment contained on any of the pipe rolls of this period¹¹. Taking account of this one discrepancy, and subtracting it from the receipt roll total, a sum of £10,592 is

¹¹E. 401/39, m. 8.

reached which approximately equals the pipe roll figure. Therefore, in terms of exchequer cash income for the two years 1257 and 1258, the pipe and receipt rolls suggest equivalent figures.

The major reason for the fall in cash receipts between the 1240s and the mid 1250s lies in the much reduced figures for the pipe roll foreign accounts. This category of revenue having provided, on average, about £8000 a year for the king in the 1240s as compared to around £2000 a year for 1255 to 1258.

The foreign account category of revenue whose fall between the 1240s and the 1250s contributed the most to the decline in the king's cash income in this period was that received from ecclesiastical vacancies. The years 1240 to 1244 had seen yearly revenues from this source of around £6000, contributing to about 20 per cent of Henry's annual cash receipts¹². When compared to the receipts for Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258 of £1462, £1208 and £364, it is apparent that Henry suffered an annual fall of around £5000 for cash from such vacancies. However, it must be noted that revenue from this source was extremely variable with the king having little control over it for the obvious reason that the death of bishops, abbots and other ecclesiastics was out of his hands. What control he did exert was over the length of a vacancy once it occurred, and Henry had certainly benefited from this in the 1240s¹³. In addition, Henry had also gained from an extraordinary number of episcopal

¹²Stacey, *Politics*, p. 222

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 220-1.

vacancies in the late 1230s and early 1240s. M. Howell has recorded 11 bishoprics as becoming vacant between February 1235 to July 1246, providing net receipts and cash receipts of £34,099 19s 16, 5d and £20,101 7s 7d respectively; and of these the Durham vacancy lasted for just under 4 years, the Winchester one for over six years and the London vacancy for about two and half years¹⁴. Yet the precarious nature of this financial source was subsequently demonstrated when, with the resolution of the vacancies at Winchester, London and Canterbury, the receipts dropped to less than £1000 total for the years 1245 to 1249¹⁵. During the mid 1250s, Henry was able to draw in revenue from the vacancies of five sees - Lincoln, Salisbury, Norwich, Ely and York - though, in contrast to the 1230s and 1240s, the length of such vacancies was much reduced, with nothing to compare to the six years for which the Winchester bishopric or the four years that the Durham bishopric were vacant for in this earlier period. Of the vacancies in the mid 1250s, Ely remained without a bishop for the longest, a period of 15 months¹⁶.

In addition to revenue from vacant bishoprics, which was the dominant source of cash income from ecclesiastical vacancies, the king was also entitled to the issues from vacant abbeys and priories. However, in the 1250s Henry seems to have forgone the possibility of revenue from such issues in exchange for granting out such vacancies for a lump sum fine. For example,

¹⁴M. Howell, *Regalian Right in Medieval England* (London, 1962), pp. 235-237.

¹⁵Stacey, *Politics*, p. 222.

¹⁶E. 372/101, m. 8.

the prior and convent of Middleton made a 50m fine with the king for the custody of their abbey during its vacancy¹⁷. What was notable about certain such fines was that Henry was granting them out before the vacancies occurred. The prior and convent of Abingdon, in May 1256, gave a bond for 500m to the king for the keeping of their abbey during its next voidance¹⁸. Similar grants were given out to Whitby, for a 100m fine, and to St. Mary, York, for a £100 fine¹⁹. In both cases the prior and convent were allowed the custody of their abbeys whenever they were to subsequently fall vacant. The impression gained by these grants is that they were a reflection of Henry's desperate need for money. By giving away vacancy rights before they arose, in return for a fine, Henry was forgoing future income in return for immediate cash. The possibility that this was a short term policy measure of raising revenue is implied by the bond over the future vacancy of Abingdon abbey. The prior and convent of this abbey had to give an undertaking '*that the king's grant to them of the said abbey during its next voidance shall not be drawn into a precedent to his prejudice*'²⁰. Matthew Paris cites this particular case as demonstrating Henry's thirst for money. The abbot of Abingdon died shortly after this fine was made and Paris states that Henry only agreed to the fine since he believed that the abbot's life '*would have been prolonged for some time*' and that Henry, on hearing of the death, exclaimed '*I have only received five*

¹⁷E. 371/21, m. 1

¹⁸E. 371/20, m. 6; CPR, 1247-58, p. 519; C. 60/53, m. 13.

¹⁹CPR, 1247-58, pp. 615, 627; C. 60/55, m. 7, 10.

²⁰CPR, 1247-58, p. 519.

*hundred marks from that rich house, so soon to become vacant, whereas, if I had but kept it in my own hands for a few days, I should have obtained from its woods alone, without any other emoluments, as much as would have added a thousand marks or more to my treasury."*²¹

Along with ecclesiastical vacancies, the other category which shows a dramatic fall for cash receipts is that of feudal forms of revenue such as marriage rights, wardships, reliefs and escheats to the crown. The foreign accounts record a fall from an average £1550 a year in the early 1240s²² to around £140 a year average in the mid 1250s. In addition, the shire accounts similarly see a large fall in this category in the region of 83 per cent (see subsequent table). As with vacancies, income from this source was liable to large fluctuations over a period of time. Henry was unlucky in the 1250s in that feudal sources of revenue were not as forthcoming for him as they had previously been. Between 1240 to 1245, he had been able to draw in income from an extraordinary number of large custodies, including the proceeds of five earldoms²³. This was not the case in the 1250s. The majority of feudal fines made between 1255 to 1258 were for relatively trivial sums of money. The only one of any sizeable amount was for 500m made by William de Beauchamp of Bedford for the king's ratification of the grant of William's lands to his son and

²¹Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, vol. 5, p. 567, ed. H. R. Luard (London, 1880); M. Paris, *English History From the Year 1235 to 1273*, trans. J. A. Giles (London, 1854), pp. 179-80.

²²Stacey, *Politics*, p. 210.

²³Ibid., p. 219.

heir²⁴. In addition to this, three other fines made for relief or marriage rights have been traced which total over £100 each²⁵. However, Henry was in fact still receiving into the exchequer money from magnates paying for their share of the Marshal inheritance. These sums have placed in the miscellaneous category in the revenue tables since they were being paid out, more or less immediately, to Simon de Montfort for his wife's inheritance rights as the former wife of William Marshal. This fall in revenue from feudal sources had a particular affect on the king's distribution of patronage. Henry had taken to granting out patronage in the form of promising future wardships and escheats to people before they had arisen. The details of this will be dealt with later, but it should be stated here that the result of this was to depress receipts from this area since, once feudal rights became available, Henry was obliged to give them out straight away.

The pipe roll figures for receipts from the shire accounts are perhaps a better means of analysing possible trends in revenue changes since they were less subject to chance factors than the foreign account receipts were. The average total for yearly revenue recorded on the shire accounts for the 1240s is just over £17,400²⁶. By the mid 1250s this had fallen to around £13,800 per year. Given also that the equivalent yearly figures for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261 work out at between £11,000 to £12,000 a year, it is fair to say that cash income for

²⁴E. 371/21, m. 3; *CPR*, 1247-58, p. 553.

²⁵E. 371/20, m. 10; E. 371/21, m. 4; E. 371/22, m. 5.

²⁶Stacey, *Politics*, p. 210

the king from the shires had fallen in the mid and late 1250s as compared to the early 1240s, the figures showing a fall of just around 20 per cent. The table below gives information about the changes in the dominant sources of revenue between these two time periods:

Revenue Category	1240s Average	1250s Average ²⁷	% Increase or Decrease
Shire Issues	£1700	£1147	-32. 5
Demesne	£5068	£4920	-3
Judicial	£4144	£4326	+4. 5
Debts	£2100	£1549	-26
Feudal	£2811	£470	-83
Taxation	£1223	£686	-44
Jews	£282	£53	-81

It is noticeable that the dominant source of revenue for the crown, demesne issues, shows only a very minor change between the two periods for cash receipts. The figures for the demesne revenue recorded on the pipe rolls are slightly larger than those contained on the receipt rolls that exist for Easter 1256 to Michaelmas 1258. These four receipt rolls show an average demesne revenue of just under £5000 per year, £4976 being recorded for Easter and Michaelmas 1257 and £4441 for the same two terms in 1258²⁸. Even accounting for the share of the pipe roll

²⁷This column is based on an average of the figures in the adjusted revenue table.

²⁸E. 401/30, 33, 36, 39.

figures that were paid into the wardrobe, the pipe roll demesne receipt figures are still slightly higher for payments into the exchequer, being £4939 for 1256-7 and £4930 for 1257-8.

This insignificant change between the 1240s and the 1250s for this category of revenue raises an interesting point which concerns the alienation of the crown demesne. The figures from the table above would imply that very few, if any, crown demesne lands were given away during the intervening period. This perhaps would not be surprising since the 1240s and 1250s saw the growth in the doctrine of the inalienability of certain possessions of the crown, i.e. the 'ancient demesne'²⁹. However, when the demesne issues from the non shire accounts are included in the total for demesne issues, a larger discrepancy between the 1240s and the 1250s occurs - a decrease of around 11 per cent. The foreign account demesne issues averaged around £570 a year in the early 1240s as compared to under £100 for the mid 1250s³⁰. This latter figure is slightly misleading in that the financial year Michaelmas 1255-56 shows £241 raised from this source whilst the two years Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1258 have receipts of only £25 and £12 respectively. Whilst this weakens the above proposition that royal demesne lands were not alienated from the crown, the decrease, as regards total demesne revenue received by the crown, is relatively minimal and certainly does not point to any widespread alienation of crown estates.

²⁹H. W. Ridgeway, 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', *EHR*, civ (1989), pp. 598, 608.

³⁰Stacey, *Politics*, p. 210.

The fall in income from the debts category probably reflects the overall fall in total revenue. However, the collection of outstanding dues by the exchequer does not seem to have been particularly thorough. Magnates who frequently owed large sums to the crown were treated leniently. The earls of Norfolk, Leicester, Gloucester and Hereford all either had their annual payments towards clearing their debts reduced during the 1250s or were not pressurised into clearing them³¹. The pipe rolls and memoranda rolls also have regular entries stating the outstanding dues of local officials from previous years' accounts against which there are either very trivial payments into the exchequer or none at all. This was something that the reformers were to complain about in their case at Amiens in 1264 when they stated that *'the arrears of the sheriffs and other bailiffs, which should be paid immediately into the exchequer before the discharge from the account, are instead, on the receipt of some trivial payment from them, attarmed for quite long periods or on the promise of some small sum annually, so that out of arrears of 400 or 500 marks or more they were attarmed to pay 100s or 10m annually, to the great loss of the lord king'*³². This point about the exchequer's attitude towards the collection of outstanding dues is more fully dealt with in the next chapter.

The slight increase in the average judicial receipts per year for the 1250s as compared to the 1240s is significant. As the only financial resource for Henry that did not decline since the

³¹D. A. Carpenter, 'King, Magnates, and Society: The Personal Rule of Henry III, 1234-1258', *Speculum*, lx (1985), pp. 53-57.

³²DBM, p. 277.

early 1240s, its importance to the king was very great, contributing to around 25 per cent of his cash income each year. It was a resource not subject to the vagaries of fluctuating availability as vacancy and feudal issues were, nor subject to pressures outside the king's control like taxation grants. The large majority of judicial receipts came from amercements made by the justices on eyre, with a small contribution made by the grants of privileges and liberties by the king in return for fines. The general eyre was in progress for most of the period 1255 to 1258, finishing in February 1258³³. The large majority of shires were visited during the course of Michaelmas 1255-56 which explains the higher judicial receipts for that year and the following year, when the bulk of the amercements imposed were collected and accounted for by the sheriffs. Whether the eyre had become financially more burdensome is difficult to tell. Cash payments into the wardrobe and exchequer were relatively constant between the early 1240s and the mid 1250s for this source. But whether expenditure credits by sheriffs placed against eyre receipts were higher or lower in the 1250s as compared to the earlier period needs a detailed examination of the pipe rolls for the early 1240s. Certainly in the mid 1250s, large credits against eyre receipts were common, usually for the payment of construction projects, purchases and munitions, and for large fee payments. For example, the Yorkshire account audit for the financial years Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258, as contained on the pipe roll for Michaelmas 1257-58, records cash

³³D. Crook, *Records of the General Eyre*, PRO Handbooks no. 20 (London, 1982), p. 120-126.

payments of £1100 from judicial receipts into the exchequer and wardrobe, but also has credit allowances against these receipts of £900 for fees and gifts paid out by the sheriff³⁴.

However, it would certainly be fair to state that the eyre was, from the 1240s, becoming more burdensome as compared to the early years of Henry's reign and was also proving to be more contentious in its effects. For example, the Annals of Burton, in 1256, notes, in the barons' objections to the king's Sicilian ambitions, '*destructio et depauperatio regni Angliae per diversa itinera justiciariorum et frequentia*'³⁵. From the financial viewpoint, trends of increasing receipts from the eyre through the reign can be seen. The eyres of 1248 and 1252 in Berkshire produced sums of £437 19s 8d and £390 2s 8d respectively in profits for the king, as opposed to sums of £190 7s in 1219 and £55 5s 4d in 1227-28³⁶. The 1246-49 general eyre raised £22,000, several thousand pounds above the proceeds of previous eyres of 1234-6³⁷.

That the administration of the general eyre had become a contentious issue by the late 1250s can be seen by the complaints about forms of amercements imposed as raised in the

³⁴E. 372/102, m. 37-40.

³⁵*Annales Monastici*, vol. I, ed. H. R. Luard (London, 1864), p. 387. '*The destruction and impoverishment of the kingdom of England through diverse and frequent eyres of the justices*'.

³⁶M. T. Clanchy, *The Roll and Writ File of the Berkshire Eyre of 1248* (Selden Society, 1973), pp. xciii-xcv.

³⁷J. R. Maddicott, 'Magna Carta and the Local Community, 1215-1259', *Past and Present*, cii (1984), p. 47.

Petition of the Barons of May 1258³⁸. It can also be seen through the fact that a sizeable share of the proposals and enactments by the reformers after the Spring of 1258 revolved around closely defining the procedure to be followed by justices on eyre³⁹. That such attention was placed by the reformers on dealing with grievances associated with the eyre points to a feeling among local society that the jurisdiction of the eyre had got out of control prior to 1258, with amercements being imposed that were perceived as not being traditionally justifiable. Given that this was the case, it would point to the general eyre being used by Henry as an instrument for raising extra revenue. Certainly such a policy on the king's part would not have been surprising with receipts falling from other categories of revenue. The eyre being the source of income most susceptible to this form of pressure.

Given that the county increments above the farm had been increasing relentlessly during the 1240s and 1250s⁴⁰, it is perhaps surprising that cash receipts from the shire issues fell so dramatically. The most likely explanation for this is that a larger number of deductions were being made against this source as expenditure credits by sheriffs. However, analysis of this category will be made in fuller detail in the subsequent chapter on shrieval accounting at the exchequer.

Other than feudal revenue, the other category of income that saw a large drop in cash receipts as compared to the

³⁸*DBM*, p. 83.

³⁹*DBM*, pp. 147, 151, 159-65.

⁴⁰D. A. Carpenter, 'The decline of the curial sheriff in England 1194-1258', *EHR*, xci (1976), p. 22.

1240s was taxation. There was no general lay taxation during these years, instead taxation proceeds during this period were dominated by the tenth imposed on the clergy. However, this church tax was directed wholly towards covering the costs of the Sicilian affair. The lay taxes on the pipe rolls and receipt rolls for these years stemmed from an aid to knight the king's son, a tallage, and a scutage to help finance the Welsh expedition of 1257. In addition to these, there are small payments for other levies such as the aid towards the marriage of the king's sister, and outstanding arrears for the Gascony aid and the remainder of the thirtieth.

The aid to knight the king's son was granted to Henry back in April 1253 when his tenants in chief agreed to pay an aid of 3m on the fee for the knighting of Edward, half to be paid at Michaelmas 1253 and half at Easter 1254⁴¹. Although the pipe rolls after Michaelmas 1255 record several payments of this aid, it would appear that these payments were mainly made prior to Michaelmas 1255 since the receipt rolls between Michaelmas 1256 to Easter 1258 record very few entries of payments of this aid into the lower exchequer, totalling only £22 14s 8. 5d⁴². The tallage was levied following Henry's return from Gascony and was worth about £8500 according to S. K. Mitchell in his study of taxation under John and Henry III⁴³. The scutage of 1257, levied at 3m a fee, was raised to help pay for the costs of the Welsh

⁴¹S. K. Mitchell, *Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III* (New Haven, 1914) , p. 254.

⁴²E. 401/28, 30, 33.

⁴³Mitchell, *Studies in Taxation*, p. 283.

campaign⁴⁴, the first payments of which start to occur on the Michaelmas 1257 receipt roll⁴⁵. Mitchell, in his account of this scutage, puts the total raised at £3420 19s⁴⁶. In both cases of the tallage and the scutage, it clearly appears that the bulk of the proceeds of these taxes were not paid in cash to the king. The revenue from taxes recorded on the pipe rolls for Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258 totals approximately £2000.

Admittedly, some of the Welsh scutage was still being paid into the exchequer after Michaelmas 1258, whilst with the missing wardrobe accounts, this figure for cash received from taxation could well be an underestimate.

It was the church that bore the brunt of taxation in the country during this period. The papacy had granted Henry a triennial tenth on ecclesiastical revenues for the expenses of a crusade, the collection of which began in July 1254⁴⁷. The collectors of this tenth compiled a new assessment, known as the valuation of Norwich, for calculating the value of the levy granted by the papacy. W. E. Lunt has reckoned that this valued the annual income of the English clergy in the region of £102,000⁴⁸. Following these arrangements, a new pope, Alexander IV, in May

⁴⁴*The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmund 1212-1301*, ed. A. Gransden (London, 1964), p. 24.

⁴⁵E. 401/33.

⁴⁶Mitchell, *Studies in Taxation*, p. 286. However, Mitchell states that this account is incomplete.

⁴⁷W. E. Lunt, *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1939), pp. 255-6.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 257, 260.

1255, authorised Henry to use the ecclesiastical taxation for the purpose of obtaining the Sicilian crown for his son Edmund⁴⁹. For this, Henry had to pay the papacy 135,541m, with the ecclesiastical tenth being renewed for a further two years⁵⁰. Financially this deal was very burdensome to the king. Given Lunt's figures for the annual value of clerical income, a tenth for nine years was needed by the king to cover the 135,541m promised to the papacy. Certain evidence, that will be commented upon later, suggests that, by 1258, this tenth was not providing enough revenue for Henry to finance the papacy's demands and that the king was having to borrow money on the collateral of other sources of income. Thus, this church taxation did not provide enough revenue to cover Henry's obligation to the pope.

The most notable point about taxation in this period is the king's failure to get any grants for general taxation of the laity. At a meeting of parliament at Easter 1255, Henry had complained of his high debts and had asked for pecuniary assistance, consisting of a tenth from the laity and clergy. This parliament decided that it would only accept such a grant if the king would swear to observe the Great Charter (Magna Carta) and if they could choose a justiciar, chancellor and treasurer, as had been old custom⁵¹. A similar request for financial assistance was made two years later at the mid-Lent parliament of 1257 when Henry asked for money for his crusade. He was promised 52,000m in return for

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 263.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 266.

⁵¹Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, vol. 5, p. 494; Mitchell, *Studies in Taxation*, p. 274.



obeying the Great Charter and on the condition '*that he would refrain from injuring and impoverishing them on so many specious pretexts*'⁵². In both these cases, Henry refused to accept the demands made of him and hence no taxation grants were made available to him. By doing this, Henry was sacrificing his financial well being for maintaining his political independence. Thus, when the possibility of a taxation grant arose in 1258 in order to support Henry's Sicilian plans, it was at the cost of Henry accepting reform of the realm.

Another of the major reasons for the fall in revenue in the 1250s as compared to the early 1240s was due to the fall in receipts from the Jews. Stacey's figures for the early 1240s record average annual income from the Jews of just over £4000 a year⁵³. The bulk of this revenue came from Jewish taxation, the shire accounts for Jewish debts only accounting for a small fraction of the overall Jewish revenue⁵⁴. In contrast, income from the Jews in the mid 1250s was comparatively minute with the pipe rolls only recording income from Jewish debts, which never totalled more than £100 in any year during this latter period, whilst the four receipt rolls from Michaelmas 1256 to Easter 1258 record total Jewish revenue for all four terms of only £97 5s 7. 5d⁵⁵. The pipe rolls do not show any cash income being received from taxation assessed on the Jews, the only such account for tallage on the Jews from 1255 records no cash as having been paid into either the

⁵²Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronic Majora*, vol. 5, pp.623-4.

⁵³Stacey, *Politics*, p. 208.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 210.

⁵⁵E. 401/28, 30, 33, 36.

exchequer or wardrobe⁵⁶.

The inability of Henry to generate income from the Jews in the mid 1250s stemmed from a grant he made to his brother, Richard of Cornwall, in early 1255. In return for a loan of 5000m from Richard, Henry agreed that Richard should receive 8000m from the Jews of England to cover the value of this loan and a previous loan of 3000m that Richard had made to Henry. This sum of 8000m was to be paid to Richard over the period Trinity 1255 to Martinmas 1256 with Henry not being permitted to levy a tallage on the Jews during this time⁵⁷. Thus a major source of revenue was denied to Henry for these years.

Unfortunately for Henry, the underlying financial situation facing the English Jewry in the mid 1250s was extremely unfavourable. So much so that, for the period 1255-70, Henry's cash income from the Jews was negligible as compared to the Jewish tallage receipts of the 1240s. By 1258, the Jews were no longer a major source of revenue for the crown. R. C. Stacey has seen the period 1240-60 as marking a watershed in the relations between the Jews and the crown⁵⁸. Henry, between 1241-55, assessed approximately 100,000m in direct taxation from the English Jews, three times more than had been assessed between 1221-39⁵⁹. The effect of these tallages was extremely damaging to

⁵⁶E. 372/104, m. 2.

⁵⁷CPR, 1247-58, pp. 400-1.

⁵⁸R. C. Stacey, '1240-60: a Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations?', *Historical Research*, lxi (1988), pp. 135-150.

⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 136-8. This figure rises towards 110,000m if the taxation granted to Richard of Cornwall is included.

the Jews as pressure to pay their taxes forced Jews into selling the bonds of their debtors at deeper discounts to raise cash⁶⁰. This had the two major outcomes of impoverishing the Jewish community and forcing the Jews into selling their bonds to Christians, since few other Jews were in a position to afford purchasing these bonds⁶¹. The first of these outcomes meant that the Jews had problems meeting the taxes imposed upon them by the king. For example, Stacey states that Richard of Cornwall had trouble collecting the 8000m due to him from the Jews and that he was still probably trying to collect this money from the Jews at the outbreak of reform in 1258⁶². Matthew Paris describes this same 8000m levy as causing the Jews, due to their impoverished state, to ask the king for permission to leave the country in 1255, a request that the king turned down⁶³.

However, it was the passing of Jewish bonds into the hands of Christians that caused political grievances which were reflected in the 1258-9 reforms. Christian purchasers of Jewish debts often aimed at acquiring permanent possession of mortgaged estates, a practice that the Jews had not usually pursued. This, combined with many Jewish debts being transferred into the hands of the king's favourites, among whom the Lusignans were the chief recipients, and less lenient terms being applied for the repayment of debts to the Jews and the holders of Jewish bonds, meant that by 1258 the issue of the Jews

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 140.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 140.

⁶²Ibid., p. 138.

⁶³Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, vol. 5, p.487.

had become a major grievance⁶⁴. Thus the Petition of the Barons in May 1258 asked for a remedy in the matter of Jews transferring their debts and pledged lands to major magnates, whose behaviour towards debtors was such that *'they continually put off the repayment of the borrowed money so that, by the intervention of death or of some other mischance, evident peril and manifest disherison plainly threatened those to whom the holdings belonged'*⁶⁵. The Provisions of Oxford then stated that reforms were to be provided in the Jewry, a demand which was further re-iterated a year later in the Provisions of Westminster⁶⁶. The unpopularity of the money lending practices associated with the Jews was further demonstrated during the rule of Simon de Montfort when *'lootings, confiscations and assaults on Jews and their property'* occurred⁶⁷.

What appears to have happened by 1258 is that Henry had mismanaged his Jewish financial resources. The heavy taxation on the Jewish community in the 1240s and early 1250s had devastated it financially by the mid 1250s, creating both a financial and political problem for the crown. The finances of the Jews were no longer sound enough to generate large taxation proceeds as can be seen by the two tallages of 1259 and 1260 which were for only 1000m each⁶⁸. Whilst the practices of the magnates taking over Jewish debts had become unpopular within

⁶⁴Stacey, '1240-60: a Watershed', p. 142-46.

⁶⁵DBM, p. 87.

⁶⁶DBM, pp. 109, 155.

⁶⁷Stacey, '1240-60: a Watershed', p. 146.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 137.

the country, resulting in the outcry against the Jews in the period of reform. Henry had thus squandered a major financial resource by 1258.

It is therefore apparent that Henry's situation, as regards his income in the 1250s, was less favourable than that in the early 1240s. Both the revenue available to Henry and the cash he actually received had declined over this period. Part of this decrease can be explained by unfavourable circumstances such as the reduced number and lengths of ecclesiastical vacancies and the reduced availability of large wardships. In addition, with the grant of Ireland to Edward in 1254 Henry had been denied revenue from this source; Ireland having provided Henry with cash receipts averaging around £1150 per annum during the first half of the 1240s⁶⁹. However, Henry had not financially helped matters himself. Both his mismanagement of Jewish financial resources and the grants of Jewish tallage to his brother had drastically reduced one major source of income, whilst his refusal to accept conditions laid down by parliament had denied him the proceeds of lay taxation. Hence, with his revenue falling, Henry was to find it difficult to meet the expenditure commitments that he had undertaken in the mid 1250s.

It is difficult to come up with a precise analysis concerning the areas into which cash expenditure out of the exchequer was going since the categories into which the king's outgoings have been subdivided vary considerably from year to year and also between the authorised outgoings in the *Liberate*

⁶⁹Stacey, *Politics*, p. 208.

Rolls and the actual outgoings contained in the issue rolls. In addition, the entries on both rolls do not always make it clear what category either an authorised or actual expenditure item should be placed in. As a result, other than comparing changes in total expenditure over the period, it is difficult to trace any clear trends in the way money was being spent.

The tables below record the totals for both the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls and also list credit allowances as recorded in the pipe rolls. The credit allowance table contains a category of pardons granted by the king. This category did not involve expenditure, but rather money that the king let people off from paying. The yearly figures on the credit allowance table are taken from the pipe roll for that year and reflect the figure for actual credits as quoted in the previous revenue tables⁷⁰. The wardrobe category for the *Liberate Rolls* and issue roll tables notes the value of cash transfers from the exchequer to the wardrobe. The miscellaneous categories contain areas of outgoings such as payments to members of the royal family (which makes up the overwhelming proportion of this category) and small miscellaneous items such as debt repayments (very small) or areas where it is not clear where the expenditure was destined for.

Liberate Rolls

Issue Rolls⁷¹

⁷⁰This has been done for simplicity as working out the categories for adjusted credits is quite complex.

⁷¹The Michaelmas 1256-7 issue roll figures reflect the outgoings of the Michaelmas 1256 term and of the Easter 1257 term. Similarly, the 1257-8

	1255-6 ⁷²	1256-7	1257-8	1256-7 ⁷³	1257-8 ⁷⁴
Alms	£101	£76	£220	£129	£3
Wages/Maint.	£794	£758	£515	£806	£698
Royal Gift	£1299	£179	£230	£957	£375
Building Works	£4266	-	£963	£3633	£938
Purchases/Munit.	£2778	£2132	£2195	£1618	£1132
Fees	£7946	£2914	£4336	£4460	£3912
Miscellaneous	£365	£776	£1513	£740	£1333
Admin. /Expenses	£411	£494	£48	£534	£98
Wardrobe	£1936	£2675	£1840	£208	£5166
TOTAL	£19,900	£10,008	£11,866	£13,092	£13,660

Pipe Roll Credits

	Mich. 1255-56	Mich. 1256-57	Mich. 1257-58.
Alms	£184	£220	£145
Wages/Maint.	£1292	£1629	£770
Royal Gift	£376	£235	£70
Building Works	£1814	£650	£991
Purchases/Munit.	£2108	£3064	£1120
Pardon	£798	£321	£503
Fees	£966	£1110	£1113
Miscellaneous	£3423	£2881	£4042
Admin. /Expenses	£767	£252	£358
TOTAL	£11,728	£10,362	£9112

figures reflect the outgoings of the Michaelmas 1257 and Easter 1258 terms.

⁷²Each year is from Michaelmas to Michaelmas.

⁷³E. 403/11, 13.

⁷⁴E. 403/15A, 17A.

In examining the cash expenditure from the exchequer as authorised by *liberate* writs for the years Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258, one sees a large fall between the authorised outgoings for the financial year Michaelmas 1255-56 as compared to the two subsequent years - £19,900 for this year and £10,008 and £11,866 for Michaelmas 1256-57 and Michaelmas 1257-58 respectively. Since the Michaelmas 1255 and Easter 1256 issue rolls are missing, it cannot be determined whether this drop was also reflected in actual payments out of the exchequer. However, it is likely that this was the case. The issue roll expenditure figures are £13,092 for Michaelmas 1256-7 with £13,660 being paid out for the following year⁷⁵, and show a large fall compared with the Michaelmas 1253-54 figure of £23,105 9s 2. 5d⁷⁶. Hence it is probable that the higher authorised expenditure of Michaelmas 1255-56, as recorded on the *Liberate Rolls*, was reflected in the exchequer issues of that year. The only reservation about this statement concerns the differences between the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls for the years Michaelmas 1256-58. The totals between the rolls differ by approximately £3000 for Michaelmas 1256-57

⁷⁵E. 403/11, 13, 15A, 17A. These figures differ compared to those contained in R. J. Whitwell, 'The Revenue and Expenditure of England under Henry III', *EHR*, xviii (1903), p. 711. This is a result of Whitwell having taken the sum totals recorded at the end of each roll for his figures. However, these totals do not always reflect the total expenditure out of the exchequer.

⁷⁶Whitwell, 'The Revenue and Expenditure', p. 711.

and by £2000 for Michaelmas 1257-58⁷⁷. Hence, it could be queried whether the *Liberate Roll* figure for Michaelmas 1255-56 is an accurate reflection of the actual outgoings of that financial year. However, the magnitude in difference between Michaelmas 1255-56 as compared to the Michaelmas 1256-58 *Liberate Roll* figures combined with the issue roll drop between Michaelmas 1253-54 and Michaelmas 1256-58 shows that certainly from Michaelmas 1256 onwards the king's outgoings fell considerably.

The dominant area into which cash issues from the exchequer went was the payment of fees to nobles and knights. The figures for such cash payments authorised in the *Liberate Rolls* changes to a great degree between Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258. The large total for Michaelmas 1255-56 is probably explained through the king granting out money for service on the Gascony expedition on his return back to England. Unfortunately, it cannot be determined what part of this fee total resulted from this expedition since there is no indication on the relevant writs whether payment was a one off for this service in Gascony or a traditional annual fee payment. The authorisation of fee payments then falls for Michaelmas 1256-57 with it rising for the following year. This trend is mirrored, but to a lesser extent, in the credit table. The likely explanation for this lies in the authorisation of the payment of fees for service in Wales following the outbreak of revolt in the Summer of 1257 and the resultant

⁷⁷The difference for this latter year could be explained in that the 1257-58 *Liberate Roll* has its last recorded entry for May 1258 which possibly suggests that it is an incomplete roll.

campaign against the Welsh⁷⁸. However, the totals on the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls for this category differ for these two years, presumably because the higher issue roll figure for fee payments for Michaelmas 1256-57, as compared to the *Liberate Rolls* figure for the same year, reflects people cashing in their fee writs which had been granted to them during the previous financial year at the exchequer. The difference between the two sets of figures for Michaelmas 1257-58 is just over £400 - the minimal discrepancy need not be explained.

The second of the major areas of expenditure out of the exchequer was for purchases and munitions. The totals for this category are relatively constant on the *Liberate Rolls*, though the Michaelmas 1255-56 figure is some £600 higher. However, the issue roll totals are considerably lower. Since the king seems to have had problems in covering his expenditure commitments (a theme that will be developed later), it can only be assumed that the reason lies in that the exchequer was not giving such authorised writs priority payment. This possible reason is backed up by a complaint in the Petition of the Barons of May 1258, where the king's officials were criticised for often taking excess prizes and that '*the lord king scarcely ever pays for his prizes, so that many English merchants are impoverished beyond measure, while alien merchants for this reason refuse to come with their goods into the kingdom...*'⁷⁹. This complaint was then later reiterated in January 1264 in the reformers' case before the French king at Amiens, with the king and his courtiers being

⁷⁸J. H. Ramsay, *The Dawn of the Constitution* (London, 1908), p. 165.

⁷⁹*DBM*, p. 85-7.

criticised for taking excess prises in wines, cloth, spices, and in other goods from merchants without payment and '*so unreasonably oppressed them with these prises and exactions that they shun the kingdom and betake themselves elsewhere with their merchandise, to the great loss of the whole realm*'⁸⁰.

The other major area of financial issues from the exchequer was in the transfer of money to the keepers of the wardrobe. Again, both sets of tables differ from one another as regards the authorised and actual transfer of funds from the exchequer into the wardrobe. For example, the *Liberate Rolls* for 1256-7 record £2675 as having been authorised to be transferred out of the exchequer and into the wardrobe, whilst the issue rolls for this year show that only £208 was actually paid out in this manner. In contrast, the subsequent year, 1257-8 shows that more money was paid into the wardrobe from the exchequer, as recorded on the issue rolls, than was ordered to be paid out via *liberate* writs issued during the course of that year. Part of the reason for this discrepancy results from the delay in paying out authorised *liberate* writs at the exchequer. A *liberate* writ was issued on 20 April 1257 to Artaud de St. Romans, the keeper of the wardrobe, for 2000m⁸¹. The issue roll for this Easter 1257 term does not record this writ as having been paid out of the lower exchequer. However, the issue roll for Michaelmas 1257 does contain a payment of 2000m to Artaud and this would appear to be have been the result of the exchequer acting on the

⁸⁰DBM, p. 275.

⁸¹CLR, 1251-60, p. 366.

liberate writ previously issued in April⁸². However, this delay in paying out *liberate* writs does not fully account for the differences between the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls over transfers to the wardrobe and so it can only be assumed that part of the reason for the higher totals on the issue rolls for 1257-58 results from the exchequer acting on commands to transfer money to the wardrobe which were not recorded on the *Liberate Rolls*.

Unfortunately, comment on this possible reason for the discrepancy is hindered by the missing wardrobe accounts for most of this period. These missing wardrobe accounts also prevent a more comprehensive analysis of royal expenditure being reached since the wardrobe was responsible for a large share of the king's exchequer outgoings - the Michaelmas 1257 and Easter 1258 issue rolls show that around 38 per cent of exchequer issues for that year were paid to Peter de Rivaux and Artaud de St.

Romans, the keepers of the wardrobe, for them to pay out to cover the king's expenses⁸³. Much of the king's household expenses were met through income going into the wardrobe, which could also provide a fast and effective way of financing emergency expenditure such as the outbreak of war or domestic problems. This latter point, i.e. the financing of military expeditions through the wardrobe, would explain why references on both the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls to money being spent on costs incurred on the Gascon and 1257 Welsh expeditions is so low. The *Liberate Rolls* give total figures for expenditure on wages for these two expeditions of £1408 for all three years, the issue rolls of £463 for

⁸²E.403/15A, m. 2.

⁸³E. 403/15A, m. 1, 2; E. 403/17A, m. 1.

its two years.

Turning to the question of whether Henry's income was sufficient enough to cover his outgoings, it can be seen, when comparing the cash receipts into and the payments out of the lower exchequer, that the two sets of figures are more or less similar for the period Michaelmas 1256 to Easter 1258 when both sets of rolls were complete, as can be seen from the table below:-

	Receipt	Rolls	Issue	Rolls
Michaelmas 1256	£7615	15s 2d	£5363	17s 3. 5d
Easter 1257	£5633	19s 4d	£7728	13s 4d
TOTAL	£13, 249	14s 6d	£13, 092	10s 7. 5d
Michaelmas 1257	£8494	17s	£8659	19s 7. 5d
Easter 1258	£4949	13s 4. 5d	£5000	2s 4. 5d
TOTAL	£13, 444	10s 4. 5d	£13, 660	2s

This similarity between the two sets of figures points to two possible aspects of the financial state of the exchequer at this time. The first is that Henry was not able to build up a store of cash at the exchequer as all his incomings were being paid out more or less immediately. The second is that he was having trouble meeting his financial obligations to others - at the minimum, with all revenue being spent, he was only just about covering such obligations. The *Liberate Rolls* for the period October 1255 to October 1257 have several entries which highlight possible financial difficulties for the king. There are several examples concerning either creditors of the king or messengers of people to whom Henry owed or promised money

being told that '*the king cannot at present make satisfaction of the money he owes*' and instead being granted small sums for the expenses that they had incurred in coming to the exchequer to collect their debts⁸⁴. For example, a *liberate* writ from April 1256 ordered 5m to be paid to the clerk and messenger of the Bishop of Morocco for his expenses homewards '*as the king cannot at present make satisfaction of the money he owes the bishop*'⁸⁵. In July 1256, another example of monetary difficulties occurs with the grant of a *liberate* writ of 40m to Roger de Pynkeny. With this writ was a mandate to the treasurer, Philip Lovel, and to Edward de Westminster that '*if they have not the money at hand, to obtain it by any means from merchants, Jews, or goldsmiths, pledging the king's jewels therefor if necessary...*'⁸⁶. In June 1258, shortly after the reform movement started, William de Taylewe and Philip the tailor of London were between them allowed to have 616 tuns of wine quit of all prise other than the king's ancient prise since both men were owed money by the king which he could not pay⁸⁷. Alongside these cases are others where certain authorised payments were put on hold until other financial commitments had been fulfilled⁸⁸. Of these latter cases, one from April 1257 raises some interesting questions. Roger de Leybourne received a 20m *liberate* writ for the '*Easter term of his yearly fee of 40m, first paying the 20,000m for the expenses of the*

⁸⁴CLR, 1251-60, pp. 260, 280, 281, 331, 337, 338, 339.

⁸⁵CLR, 1251-60, p. 280.

⁸⁶CLR, 1251-60, p. 309.

⁸⁷CPR, 1247-58, p. 634.

⁸⁸CLR, 1251-60, pp. 320, 323, 324, 364.

*household, and the £1000 for the expenses of the church of Westminster, reserved out of the first moneys to come to the Exchequer of Easter and Michaelmas*⁸⁹. There is an implication here that Henry was trying to reserve revenue coming into the exchequer for the purpose of paying off specific expenditure items, and thus creating a priority payment system.

This proposal to set aside revenue for covering specific expenditure items could thus possibly signify an attempt at limited reform of the king's finances. Whether this initiative came from the king is debatable. The *Close Rolls*, for April 1257, also record this proposal about reserving the above two sums of money at the exchequer, but state that this command was made in the presence of members of the council⁹⁰. This could suggest the possibility of pressure from the magnates being exerted on the king for him to tidy up his finances. However, this proposal was not carried out in full as can be seen from the subsequent issues out of the exchequer. Both the Easter and Michaelmas 1257 issue rolls record large payments out of the exchequer for building works, £3500 and £805 respectively⁹¹, though the payments out of the exchequer to Artaud de St. Romans, the keeper of the wardrobe, for household expenses do not come anywhere near the 20,000m figure in the above mentioned writ. No payments were made to Artaud at Easter 1257, though he did receive £3533 6s 8d at the Michaelmas 1257 exchequer⁹². Since household expense

⁸⁹*CLR*, 1251-60, p. 364.

⁹⁰*Close Rolls*, 1256-59, p. 46-47

⁹¹E. 403/13,15A.

⁹²E. 403/15A, m. 1, 2.

payments out of the exchequer fell so far short of the 20,000m reserved, it suggests either that Henry was having severe trouble raising money to service his debts or rather that the amount of the sums reserved for Henry's household expenses was so large that there was no way that the exchequer could cover the 20,000m. This sum was equivalent to the receipts of the lower exchequer for a year. Thus, this proposal for reserving revenue for the payment of specific items was misguided in that the proposed reserved sum was totally unrealistic when set besides the annual receipts of the exchequer.

Despite these apparent problems over balancing revenue and expenditure into and out of the exchequer, Henry was able to pursue a policy of building up a reserve of treasure. As D. A. Carpenter has shown, this was a collection of gold which was gathered between the end of 1254 and the political revolution of 1258, and was sold in France in 1259-60 and in London in 1261⁹³. This treasure seems to have been collected with the intention of funding the king's Sicilian ambitions, Henry having accepted from the pope the offer of the throne of Sicily for his son Edmund⁹⁴. However, the accumulation of gold by Henry was not without its problems. It was only possible for him to start saving gold in the first place on his return from Gascony in 1254 through a loan from Richard of Cornwall to help support the household expenses, whilst silver initially earmarked for the purchase of gold had to be surrendered between November 1256 and July

⁹³D. A. Carpenter, 'The Gold Treasure of King Henry III', *Thirteenth Century England I*, pp. 61-88.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 74.

1257 to help meet the expenses of the royal household and the costs of the 1257 Welsh expedition⁹⁵. This loan from Richard of Cornwall came at the expense of Jewish revenue for the king, Henry having had to assign the Jews over to Richard for part payment of the loan (as mentioned previously). Henry then subsequently broke into his gold treasure in 1257 with the launch of a gold coinage, a result of the need to meet the looming costs of the Welsh campaign⁹⁶. Carpenter estimates that, by the time of the 1258 political revolution, Henry held at least 500mg of gold (equivalent to 5000m of silver) along with gold and silver plate in the wardrobe of over 1200m of silver⁹⁷. Although this treasure shows that Henry was not desperately short of money, the size of this store as compared to the sum he needed to finance his Sicilian expedition was tiny. His ability to generate the resources to finance such ambitions thus appears to have been minimal. Not only that, but there was also an inverse financial aspect for Henry in trying to build up this gold treasure. He had had to forgo revenue from the Jews, whilst money used to build up the gold store was money that could have provided him with the means to pay off other debts which, as stated previously, he had trouble doing. Therefore, the impression gained is that the accumulation of this gold treasure did not actually improve Henry's overall financial situation.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 76. This occurrence would help explain the low figures on the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls for payments towards the costs of the Welsh expedition.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 79.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 75.

It is worth pointing out here that Henry's collection of gold took place through the wardrobe with the fine rolls showing that fines of gold for the purchase of liberties and for respite of knighthood were being paid cash down into the wardrobe⁹⁸. As the wardrobe accounts are missing for most of the Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258 period, it cannot be determined precisely how much gold Henry accumulated during this period and thus the annual value of these gold payments has gone unrecorded in the income tables at the beginning of this chapter. However, Carpenter records 535 mg of gold, which is noted on the fine rolls, as having been paid into the wardrobe between 30 April 1256 and 7 July 1258⁹⁹. This can be interpreted as the equivalent of 5350m of silver paid to the king over this two year period - approximately £1783 6s 8d per annum¹⁰⁰. Bearing this figure in mind, the total notional income figures for 1255-58 underestimates Henry's income for this period by perhaps around £1500 to £2000 a year¹⁰¹. However, this discrepancy does not undermine the basic premise that Henry's income had declined in the mid 1250s as compared to the levels of the early 1240s and it is still fair to comment that Henry's cash income was still over £10,000 a year lower in the mid 1250s than in the earlier period.

That Henry was having problems raising the revenue

⁹⁸Ibid., pp.74, 76-77.

⁹⁹Ibid., p.74.

¹⁰⁰1mg of gold was equivalent to 10m of silver.

¹⁰¹Obviously a precise figure for this discrepancy cannot be given due to the missing wardrobe accounts.

to cover his proposed expenditure plans is quite clear from the amount of loans that he was taking out. These loans were being contracted for two separate reasons. The large majority of the money the king was borrowing was for the costs associated with Henry's Sicilian ambitions and were financed by Italian merchants. The second reason why money was being borrowed was to cover Henry's 'ordinary' expenditure commitments. This latter reason will be covered first.

The money borrowed during the course of 1255-56 probably stemmed from the need for the king to meet financial demands and money shortages following the Gascon expedition. Matthew Paris states that, on Henry's return to England from Gascony in early 1255, Henry's debts '*were reported to amount to more than three hundred thousand marks*'¹⁰². Whilst Paris's comment on the amount of Henry's debts could well be a huge overestimate, Henry certainly was lumbered with large debts. As stated previously, Henry had borrowed 10,000m from his brother, the Earl of Cornwall, to help meet the household expenses. In November 1255, Henry made arrangements for the repayment of 1000m that he had borrowed from Nicholas, former Bishop of Durham¹⁰³. Four months later, the treasurer, Philip Lovel, was empowered to raise a loan of either 1000m or 800m from merchants or others, using the issues of the vacancies at York and Salisbury bishoprics and Evesham Abbey as security¹⁰⁴. Then, in September of 1256, Henry pledged the gold deposited in his

¹⁰²Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, vol. 5, p.484.

¹⁰³CPR, 1247-58, p. 448

¹⁰⁴CPR, 1247-58, p. 461.

treasury as collateral for 1300m he borrowed from the prior and convent of Westminster '*for arduous affairs*' out of the money of the cross deposited at their house, with a promise to repay the money within two months¹⁰⁵. Three months later, Henry assigned 110m out of the farms of his manors of Andover and Alton for the following Easter term to the elect of Winchester for money the elect had loaned the king to pay fees that he owed¹⁰⁶. These latter two cases imply that the king was having cash flow problems during the last part of 1256.

For most of 1257, there is little sign of Henry having to borrow money on a short term basis. Other than bonds connected with Italian/ Sicilian affairs, the only item of any note connected with loans is that of the king assigning 2200m from ecclesiastical lands in Ireland that were vacant to Bordeaux merchants for the completion of the payment of money that Henry had borrowed from them when last in Gascony¹⁰⁷. However, for the financial year Michaelmas 1257-58 the picture changes. In November 1257, Henry gave William de Valence a bond for 1100m, to be repaid out of the first moneys received at the exchequer by Lent, for a loan received from William enabling the king to pay the pope¹⁰⁸. The exchequer issue rolls for Michaelmas 1257 record a payment of 1000m to the pope for his yearly fee for the 39th year of Henry's reign (October 1254-October 1255), the money for this

¹⁰⁵CPR, 1247-58, pp. 500-1.

¹⁰⁶CPR, 1247-58, p. 532.

¹⁰⁷CPR, 1247-58, p. 555

¹⁰⁸CPR, 1247-58, p. 603.

presumably having come from this loan of William's¹⁰⁹. The remaining 100m contained in this bond could have been intended as interest or compensation for William in loaning this money to the king. However, as regards paying this bond, Henry did not keep his promise to William, suggesting severe money problems for the king at this time. The only payment that has been traced out of the exchequer concerning this bond was one of £43 4s 1d to William in the same Michaelmas 1257 issue roll¹¹⁰. This was not the only loan that Henry contracted during this financial year for the payment of fees owing to the pope. 2000m was borrowed from Italian merchants in May 1258, with the promise to repay on the quinzaine of Michaelmas next, along with 250m profit for the merchants, for the payment of the pope's yearly fee for two years¹¹¹. In taking out this loan, Henry bound over the church of Westminster and its abbot and convent to the merchants. In return, for the indemnity of the church, Henry pledged to them jewels which were on deposit in the treasury of the church¹¹².

The Spring and Summer of 1258, coinciding with the outbreak of reform, provides ample evidence of further financial problems for the king. The abbots and convents of Waltham, Reading and St. Albans, at the king's instance, bound themselves to French merchants for a 2500m loan to the king¹¹³, though it is possible that this loan might have been connected with the king's

¹⁰⁹E. 403/15A, m. 3.

¹¹⁰E. 403/15A, m. 3.

¹¹¹*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 631.

¹¹²*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 634.

¹¹³*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 625.

previous Gascon expedition. However, two subsequent cases, in August 1258, give stronger evidence of cash flow problems for the king. The *Patent Rolls* record a notification to the abbot and convent of Waltham that the king was sending men to take 900m out of the money of the will of Warin de Munchenese, which was on deposit in their house, with a promise on the king's part to '*restore the same in its said place before the quinzaine of St. Edward*'¹¹⁴. A similar notification was given on the same day to the abbot and convent of Beaulieu that the king was sending Robert Walerand to receive a loan of 1000m of silver out of the Elect of Winchester's moneys on deposit in their house, with 100m of gold to be placed with them as collateral. Again, a promise was made by the king to restore the money as soon as was possible¹¹⁵.

The evidence provided above thus points to Henry having financial difficulties in the mid 1250s in covering his expenditure and, as a result, having to resort to taking out loans and bonds on either the security of his gold treasure or other sources to raise money. The fact that so many such loans were taken out during the course of the financial year Michaelmas 1257 to Michaelmas 1258 suggests that at the outbreak of revolution in April/ May 1258, the king's overall financial position was very unstable. Although this in itself probably did not cause the magnates to oppose the king, it certainly weakened the king's hand in dealing with this opposition since he did not have the financial resources available with which to provide ready patronage to the magnates and thus prevent outright rebellion to

¹¹⁴*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 643.

¹¹⁵*CPR*, 1247-58, pp. 643-4.

his regime.

It was for financing Henry's Sicilian ambitions that the king had to borrow the largest sums of money. Henry had accepted the papal offer of the Sicilian throne for his son, Edmund, in 1254. For this, Henry had to pay the pope 135,541m and send an army to conquer the kingdom or risk interdict and excommunication¹¹⁶. Henry could not hope to raise such a sum through his 'ordinary' receipts, and, as has been shown, his attempts to build up a gold treasure to help finance this proposed expedition proved unsuccessful. Therefore, in trying to raise these 135,000m, Henry had to fall back on taking out large loans from Italian merchants, using the receipts of church taxation, as authorised by the pope, as collateral. On top of this, Henry was also burdened with the expenses of the envoys he was sending to Rome to pursue and further his Sicilian affairs. The largest loan that Henry contracted was for 41,000m from merchants in Sienna. This loan and a further one of 2000m from Florentine merchants were raised on the basis of payment coming from the church tenth being levied on the English church¹¹⁷. A further loan of 8000m which royal envoys to Rome were ordered to contract in June 1256 might possibly have been contracted on similar terms (though there is no mention of what collateral was used)¹¹⁸. However, for money borrowed after this date, the king had to put up other resources for collateral as well. In June 1257, Henry, along with his wife and his son, Edward, entered into a bond for

¹¹⁶D. A. Carpenter, 'What happened in 1258?', p. 107.

¹¹⁷*CPR*, 1247-58, pp. 519, 520.

¹¹⁸*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 481.

10,000m with merchants of Florence with a promise to pay it back before Midsummer 1258. Onerous terms were imposed for a failure to meet this commitment, with the equivalent of an interest rate of 10 per cent every two months to be paid on any outstanding dues after that date. For this bond, Henry put up as collateral any issues arising from void church lands, wardships, marriage rights, Jewish escheats, the sale of woods and forests, and any other revenue arising from the tenth on ecclesiastical revenues and from the fruits of other '*apostolic graces*' granted to the king (though certain exceptions were made for any such issues promised to William de Valence, Simon de Montfort and certain other creditors of the king). The merchants were to transfer the amount of this bond to the king's envoys to the court of Rome¹¹⁹. A further but smaller loan for covering the expenses of envoys in Rome was taken out in May 1258, to be repaid within the octaves of Christmas. This loan for £550 was taken out from merchants of Sienna, for which payment the king bound over certain gold and silver jewels of his¹²⁰.

The taking out of such large loans, as outlined above, for the pursuit of the Sicilian affair was obviously a large drain on Henry's financial resources. Admittedly the repayment of most of these loans came from ecclesiastical taxation granted by the papacy specifically for the purpose of funding Henry's Sicilian ambitions¹²¹. However, Henry did have to direct revenue from

¹¹⁹*CPR*, 1247-58, pp. 562-3.

¹²⁰*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 629.

¹²¹*CPR*, 1247-58, pp. 519, 563, 566. These references refer to money from the ecclesiastical tenth being paid over or collected by merchants for the

other sources to further this affair. The last two loans mentioned above imply this since collateral other than the ecclesiastical tenth had to be put up, whilst, in June 1257, the count of Anjou had been ordered to pay the 4000m that he owed the king over to Florentine merchants¹²². In effect, what had happened by the Summer of 1258 was that the king had mortgaged a sizeable amount of his financial resources on the pursuit of an impractical policy.

As king, Henry was expected to provide a constant supply of patronage to the nobility and to curiales. But the provision of patronage was a costly business to the crown, both in terms of expenditure, with the king having to pay out money fees, and also in terms of revenue forgone by the king, i.e. by grants of escheats and/or lands pertaining to the crown which entailed a money loss to the king's possible revenue. Yet failure to provide adequate and a fair distribution of patronage was always likely to cause friction between the king and sections of the magnates. It was this latter scenario, when a group of magnates turned against the Lusignans, which came about in the Spring of 1258 and sparked off the political crisis which lead to reform.

The Lusignans' arrival in England in 1247 was to place a large strain on Henry's ability to meet the patronage demands made of him in the 1250s. The problems facing Henry in this area were compounded by circumstances partly out of his control. The king's supply of suitable land for patronage purposes was smaller

repayment of their loans to the king.

¹²²*CPR, 1247-58*, p. 559.

than it had been at any other point earlier in his reign, with nothing to compare to the demise of the Marshals or the '*great mortality of earls*' of the 1240s to provide lands for the king to give away¹²³. Alongside this was the growth in the 1240s and 1250s of the doctrine of the inalienability of the '*ancient demesne*' of the crown¹²⁴, whereby certain crown lands could not be used for patronage purposes. It was in regards to this that royal councillors swore not to consent to alienations from the royal demesne in 1257, the Annals of Burton stating '*quod nihil consentient alienari de his quae ad antiquum dominium coronae pertinent*'¹²⁵. Thus the task of providing adequate patronage was made that much harder for Henry. Therefore, in lieu of land grants, Henry was restricted to providing money fees instead as a means of fulfilling his patronage obligations. The four surviving exchequer issue rolls of this period, from Michaelmas 1256 through to Easter 1258, help to highlight the cash drain to Henry caused by the granting of these fees. In these two years alone, £1000 was paid out to Simon de Montfort¹²⁶, £766 1m to Guy de Lusignan¹²⁷, £521 18s 1d to William de Valence¹²⁸ and £420 to Geoffrey de Lusignan¹²⁹ for either fees or for monetary compensation instead of land. On top of these payments, Simon de

¹²³Ridgeway, 'Foreign Favourites', p. 596.

¹²⁴Ibid., pp. 598, 608.

¹²⁵*Annales Monastici*, vol. i, p. 364.

¹²⁶E. 403/11, m. 1; E. 403/13, m. 4; E. 403/15A, m. 3; E. 403/17A

¹²⁷E. 403/11, m. 1; E. 403/13, m. 2; E. 403/17A, m. 3.

¹²⁸E. 403/11, m. 1; E. 403/15A, m. 1, 2; E. 403/17A, m. 1.

¹²⁹E. 403/11, m. 1, 2; E. 403/17A, m. 1.

Montfort was paid a further 600m yearly from the county farms of Warwick/ Leicester, Oxford/ Berkshire, Wiltshire and Nottingham/ Derby¹³⁰. Geoffrey de Lusignan received an additional 200m from Isabella, formerly the wife of Radulf de Hain, from a marriage fine she had made with the king¹³¹ and 500m from the Yorkshire eyre¹³², whilst William de Valence received £40 from the Norfolk/ Suffolk county issues¹³³, £200 from the debts of William de Lancaster¹³⁴ and was pardoned by the king of the 514m 4s 1. 5d that he owed for his share of the dowry due to Simon de Montfort's wife¹³⁵. This latter sum was subsequently paid to de Montfort by order of the king out of the Yorkshire eyre issues¹³⁶. The payment of so many and such large fees by the king was a criticism levied at Henry by the reformers at Amiens in 1264. Of the courtiers and aliens around Henry, it was complained that *'out of the assured revenues of the lord king they procured grants of so many and such large fees to be paid to themselves and others by the hand of the treasurer in the*

¹³⁰E. 372/100, 101, 102. Simon also received 1600m from the Countess of Lincoln for her share of the dowry owed to his wife (E. 368/32, m. 10; E.372/100, m. 15d).

¹³¹E. 372/100, m. 9d.

¹³²E. 372/102, m. 39d. This sum was granted to Geoffrey in compensation of the expenses and losses sustained for the land which the king had granted to him in Ireland and which he did not obtain (*CPR, 1247-58*, p. 535).

¹³³E. 372/101, m. 13

¹³⁴E. 372/101, m. 35d

¹³⁵E. 372/100, m. 10d

¹³⁶E. 372/102, m. 39d.

*exchequer, that the royal patrimony was almost completely exhausted by fees of this kind*¹³⁷.

The payment of such large sums of money to the above mentioned four was thus a large drain on the exchequer. On top of this, Henry tended to be in arrears in the payment of the fees he had promised. The Michaelmas 1256 to Trinity 1257 memoranda roll, in the Michaelmas *communia* section, contains two tables outlining the payments made to Simon de Montfort concerning the king's debts to him. The outstanding total debt enrolled as being owed to Simon by Henry was 1309m 3s 4d¹³⁸. The payment from the Michaelmas 1256 exchequer to Simon for £200 was for the Michaelmas 1254 term of the £400 he was supposed to receive yearly for his wife's dower¹³⁹. Similarly, the £600 he received for the dower at the Michaelmas 1257 exchequer was for the Easter term 1255 and both terms of the Michaelmas 1255-56 year¹⁴⁰. In addition, Henry's annual payments to the pope were in arrears, with the payment of 1000m at the Easter 1257 exchequer being for the year Michaelmas 1255-1256 and the 1000m payment at Michaelmas 1257 being for the year Michaelmas 1254-55¹⁴¹. In fact, as mentioned previously, Henry ended up having to borrow money to cover the costs of two years' worth of the papal fee in May

¹³⁷DBM, p. 277.

¹³⁸E. 368/32, m. 4, 4d.

¹³⁹E. 403/11, m. 1.

¹⁴⁰E. 403/15A, m. 3.

¹⁴¹E. 403/13, m. 2; E. 403/15A, m. 3

1258¹⁴². In contrast, fee payments to the Lusignans did not tend to be so far in arrears. Other than two exceptions concerning Guy de Lusignan, where the £150 paid out of the Michaelmas 1256 exchequer was for the Michaelmas 1255 term and the £150 out of the Easter 1258 exchequer was for Michaelmas 1256 term¹⁴³, the fee payments out to the Lusignans were never more than a year in arrears. However, admittedly by the time of the revolution in Spring 1258, their fee dues had not been fully satisfied by the king¹⁴⁴. But it does seem that Henry made a greater effort in fulfilling his financial commitments to the Lusignans than in covering his dues to others. The result of this was to help further the differences between the court factions, with Simon de Montfort beginning to publicly quarrel with William de Valence in 1257 as Simon exerted pressure on the king for the settlement of money and land owed to him¹⁴⁵.

Alongside the provision of land, the other traditional source of patronage for the king was in the provision of escheats, wardships and marriage rights. Ridgeway has highlighted the problems that Henry faced in trying to use these sources to compensate the Lusignans, and certainly in general Henry had trouble in matching his promises of patronage with the feudal resources available to him to grant away. The reformers at Amiens in 1264 laid the blame for this on courtiers and aliens

¹⁴²*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 631.

¹⁴³E. 403/11, m. 1; E. 403/17A, m. 3

¹⁴⁴Ridgeway, 'Foreign Favourites', p. 604. Ridgeway mentions that the Lusignans' fees were beginning to fall into arrears from 1256 onwards.

¹⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 603.

who '*leaguings themselves together and pushing each others' interests, arranged that escheats, wardships and other perquisites of the lord king, by means of which he ought to replenish his treasury.... should be conferred upon themselves in turn*'¹⁴⁶. Their criticism seems to have been justified since, as has been shown, the receipts for the king from this feudal source of revenue had reached a trivial sum by the mid 1250s. This situation had arisen through Henry's grants of patronage from this source before any such issues became available. This is reflected in the *Liberate Rolls* with the number of entries authorising fee payments out of the exchequer to people in lieu of wardships or escheats granted to them¹⁴⁷. The standard wording of this writs was, as in the case of William de Turbervyle who was granted 20m a year, '*as a fee till the king shall make provision for him of 20 marks' worth of land in wards or escheats*'¹⁴⁸. However, it is noticeable that there is only one such grant for the year Michaelmas 1257-58 year which might possibly reflect a realisation on the king's part that his patronage policies had run into trouble and that he needed to curtail such grants. In general, the result of this situation was not only to reduce Henry's income from feudal sources, but also to increase his expenditure on fees.

Henry had therefore, by the mid 1250s, found himself in a vicious circle as a result of his patronage policy. He had allowed himself to promise commitments which were difficult for him to honour in full. His excessive granting of wardships and

¹⁴⁶DBM, p. 277.

¹⁴⁷CLR, 1251-60, pp. 248, 323, 325, 327, 333, 334, 385, 404.

¹⁴⁸CLR, 1251-60, p. 323.

escheats reduced his income from these sources but also meant that he did not have enough of these resources to cover his promised grants. The result was having to grant money fees instead which thus further increased the financial burden on the exchequer.

Clearly, by the Spring of 1258, Henry had run into severe financial difficulties. The exchequer was certainly not building up a cash surplus, with its receipts being paid out straightaway, whilst Henry's gold treasure was both small and being eroded. The fault was not totally that of Henry's own making as the availability of large ecclesiastical vacancies and large escheats and wardships had not been as common in the mid 1250s as in the early 1240s. This helped to depress not only royal revenues but also to affect the king's distribution of patronage. Yet, Henry had not helped his position by undertaking commitments, such as the Sicilian affair or grants to the Lusignans, which he could not easily undertake to fulfil without causing political resentment or financial problems. The result was cash flow problems for the king (as seen by the short term loans he took out), an attempt at a priority payment system at the exchequer, and the exchange of possible future financial income in return for immediate cash or immediate patronage, i.e. through these loans taken out or through wardships and escheats granted before they became available. Henry had mortgaged himself to the hilt, and when court factionalism broke out into the open in early 1258 and a section of the magnates demanded reform, Henry did not have the financial means to either resist the reforming demands or to pacify both sides.

Chapter 3

The Sheriffs, the Exchequer and Baronial Reform 1255-61

One of the more important areas of the reform program initiated by the barons in 1258, following the collapse of Henry III's personal administration, was that concerned with the administration of local government. This chapter will examine one particular aspect of this reform programme - that concerned with the policies applied to the administration of the exchequer in regard to the terms on which the county sheriffs held office and the success or failure of the reforms introduced.

The Reforms

There were several reforms introduced to the administration of the sheriff's office during the course of 1258-59. The first of these concerned the terms on which the sheriffs held office. In the years leading up to 1258, the sheriff had generally rendered his account at the exchequer '*ut firmarius*', that is he accounted for the traditional farm of his county and an additional fixed increment, the increment being a fixed sum of money above the county farm which the sheriff was liable to pay. Sheriffs were thus allowed to keep any sum of money that they raised which

exceeded the value of their farms and increments. This method of accounting was not wholly popular in the localities and thus, once the reform program got under way in 1258, one of the first grievances addressed was the terms on which the county sheriffs held office. Instead of rendering for their accounts at farm, the sheriffs were to act as custodians for their respective shires, accounting for the variable profits above the traditional farm. This change from the counties being held by sheriffs rendering for a fixed increment to one where they accounted for all receipts raised above the basic county farm was not specifically mentioned in the reforms promulgated in 1258-59. The evidence for this reform comes from the pipe rolls where the accounts for the year Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 show that the sheriffs in office for that period did not have to render for fixed increments, instead they were liable for all the money raised above the basic county farm.

The second reform led on from this first one in that, instead of keeping any surplus raised above the farm and fixed increment for themselves, the sheriffs were to receive a salary allowance. This announcement was first stated in the Provisions of Oxford: *'Let the king pay him (the sheriff) out of his own revenues, according to his proffer, sufficiently to enable him to administer the county justly'*. It was referred to again in the Ordinance of the Sheriffs: *'For when the sheriff comes at the end of the his year, he will be allowed on his account the reasonable expenses which he will have incurred in keeping his bailiwick. . . .*

. . and for this we give him of our own revenues, since we wish that he shall have no reason to take anything from someone else'¹.

The third of the reforms was that sheriffs were to serve in the shrieval office for only one year at a time. Again this demand was repeated twice with the Provisions of Oxford stating that those appointed were '*not to be sheriff for more than one year at a time*', and the Ordinance of the Sheriffs commenting that '*neither sheriff nor any other, shall remain in office for more than one year, and this we wish you to know so that if hardships or wrongs are committed against you by the said bailiffs, you shall fear them all the less, and more boldly reveal their wrongdoing*'².

Not only was shrieval tenure limited, but appointed sheriffs had to hold land in the county of their office. The Provisions of Oxford demanded that '*sheriffs shall be appointed who are loyal men and sound landholders, so that in each county there shall be as sheriff a vavasour of that same county*'³. This was subsequently re-iterated in the Provisions of Westminster, when the sheriffs for 1259-60 were being appointed with the proviso that '*they shall be vavassors of the same counties*'⁴. This particular clause in the Provisions of Westminster also allowed for the localities to have a say in the selection of their sheriffs, the details of which will be commented upon later in this chapter.

In addition to the above four major reforms to the shrieval office, there were a variety of other reforms that were

¹ *DBM*, pp. 109, 123.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 123.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 109

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

introduced, the aim of which was to control the behaviour of sheriffs in the day to day administration of their offices. The Ordinance of the Sheriffs, in particular, outlined the behaviour expected of sheriffs; the rights of hospitality which sheriffs and their officials could expect was clearly laid out, whilst the sheriffs were also instructed not to employ an excessive number of sergeants, nor to let out at farm any of the bailiwicks under their control, nor to accept any bribes⁵. The Provisions of Westminster then demanded further restrictions on the sheriffs, in that limits were placed on those whom the sheriff could expect to attend his tourn, whilst four knights were to be appointed in each county to review the wrongs committed by the sheriffs⁶.

The Years before 1258

The need for the above changes relating to the shires and sheriffs, as initiated by the reforming magnates, have to be placed within the context of shrieval behaviour in the localities and the policy and attitude of the king and the exchequer towards shrieval office holders in the years before 1258.

Between 1236 to 1241, the majority of sheriffs were custodians of their counties and had answered for variable profits above the farm, receiving allowances for their tenure of office. This system of accounting for shire issues was dropped in 1241

⁵Ibid., pp. 121-23.

⁶Ibid., pp. 141, 153.

and fixed increments above the farm were reintroduced⁷. The seventeen years following this period had subsequently seen the value of the increments allocated to the counties rising steadily. The fixed increments in 1240-1 were worth £1596 6s 8d according to the *Liber Rubeus de Scaccario*. D. A. Carpenter has calculated that £1540 was demanded in 1241-2, nearly £2320 in 1251-2 and approaching £2500 in 1256-7⁸. These increments left many sheriffs worse off than between 1236-1241 as their size was such as to leave them a smaller proportion of the county revenue than that conceded by the allowances⁹. It was these rising increments, and hence the increasing financial burden placed on the counties, that explain the relevant complaint contained in the Petition of the Barons of May 1258 about sheriffs holding their counties at such high farms that they could not recover the relevant amounts from them¹⁰. This would also account for the similar grievance, which was presented to the French king, Louis IX at Amiens, in January 1264, about how counties had been formerly let at fixed and moderate farms, but how, under Henry, increments had been increased successively¹¹.

Alongside trying to honour these rising financial demands, the county sheriffs were further burdened by other

⁷D. A. Carpenter, 'The Decline of the curial sheriff in England, 1194-1258', *EHR*, xci (1976), p. 21.

⁸*Liber Rubeus de Scaccario*, Part II, ed. H. Hall (London, 1896), pp. 771-772; Carpenter, 'The Decline of the curial sheriff', pp. 21-3.

⁹Carpenter, 'The Decline of the curial sheriff', p. 21.

¹⁰*DBM*, p. 83.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 275.

factors in the pursuit of their duties. Sheriffs were increasingly unable to deal with the more powerful members of the nobility. D. A. Carpenter has highlighted how the twenty years prior to 1258 had been a time of relative slack for the magnates, with sheriffs having difficulty in effectively distraining these men for their debts. At the same time, powerful magnates were making inroads into the authority of the sheriffs as they increased the jurisdiction of their own courts. The 1255 inquiry in the articles of the eyre into usurpations of liberties tells of magnates being accused of preventing sheriffs from entering their lands to pursue their official duties. For example, Robert de Totehale, the sheriff of Buckingham and Bedford for 1256-58, claimed allowance in his farm for money he could not raise because of the power of the Earls of Gloucester and Cornwall and of William de Valence¹². This scenario had arisen through the increasing use of non curial sheriffs, men lacking the power '*to keep magnates in check and uphold royal interests against them in the localities*'¹³, a policy derived from the desire to increase the revenue from shire issues. The power of a curial sheriff in upholding royal power in the counties against the magnates was thus sacrificed for the need for increased income. The curial sheriff being deemed inappropriate to hold office on terms which deprived him of private gain¹⁴.

¹²D. A. Carpenter, 'Kings, Magnates, and society: the personal rule of King Henry III, 1234-1258', *Speculum*, lx (1985), pp. 53, 63, 64, 65.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 66.

¹⁴Carpenter, 'The Decline of the curial sheriff', p. 4; R. C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy, and Finance under Henry III, 1216-45* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 63-4.

Stacey states that the really decisive exodus of the curial sheriffs from

Hence, by 1258, the shrieval office had become subject to two major conflicting pressures which hampered a smooth running of the office: the sheriff had to contend with Exchequer demands for higher increments, whilst at the same time suffering from a decline in his local authority. The situation had become ripe for abuse of the shrieval office.

With the increments becoming so large between 1241 and 1258, sheriffs increasingly found that they did not have enough revenue left for their sustenance, and thus they resorted to the imposition of fees and the exploitation of traditional rights of hospitality¹⁵. The overuse of such hospitality rights became a grievance which, as stated previously, was remedied in October 1258 in the Ordinance of Sheriffs. Henceforth, sheriffs were ordered not to take anything from anyone on the pretext of their office *'save only food and drink such is usually served'*¹⁶. However, it was other grievances that were aired and reforms initiated after April 1258 that point to more serious abuses of office. The Petition of the Barons of May 1258 complained of officials not amercing men according to the gravity of their offences, but rather forcing them to pay ransoms beyond their means¹⁷; commands in The Provisions of Oxford ordered sheriffs

office occurred in the late 1240s, probably as a result of the additional increments which Henry imposed after 1248 on the shires.

¹⁵Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial sheriff', p. 23.

¹⁶*DBM*, p. 121.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 83.

not to take bribes¹⁸; whilst the Ordinance of Sheriffs mentioned that sheriffs were not to employ excessive numbers of men, and that those men employed were not to demand goods or money, going on to further state that sheriffs '*will not let out at farm to anyone counties, hundreds, wapentakes, nor any other bailiwick of our realm*'¹⁹. These complaints and others were then reiterated in January 1264 in the Baron's case before the French king at Amiens where reforms to the shrieval office were defended on the grounds that it had become prone to judicial and financial abuse, that high increments had led to officials pursuing illicit extortions, and that arrears of sheriffs and bailiffs were often paid off at trivial rates of annual payment²⁰.

Matthew Paris had some very unfavourable words for a few of the sheriffs in office between 1255-58, thus providing other evidence for both the unpopularity of sheriffs and their misbehaviour. For 1256, Matthew records the Northamptonshire sheriff William de Lisle as having been found guilty, by a commission sent out by the king in that year, of wrongfully imprisoning a herdsman, of false accusations and theft of cattle and '*still worse offences*', and that William only escaped the death penalty through the intercession of the king and queen of Scotland²¹. On the death of William Heron, the Northumberland sheriff, in 1258, Matthew commented that he was '*a most*

¹⁸Ibid., p. 109.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 121.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 263, 275.

²¹Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, vol. 5, ed. H. R. Luard (London, 1880), pp. 577-81.

*avaricious man, a hammer of cruelty to the poor, and a persecutor of the religious orders*²². Complaints about William's behaviour were still being noted after the civil war when a writ, from October 1268, issued to itinerant justices in Northumberland, mentioned the unlawful use of the sheriff's tourn by William during his shrieval tenure. This writ thus backs up Matthew's unfavourable comments on William²³. For the same year (1258), Matthew also mentions that '*The sheriff of Northampton, following in the track of his predecessor, William de Lisle, the late sheriff, and stimulated by avarice, inflicted injuries on several innocent persons*' and that, following a complaint to Hugh Bigod, the chief justiciary, '*he was found guilty of perpetrating several deeds of iniquity and injustice. . . . and committed to close confinement, narrowly escaping with his life*'²⁴. This sheriff was presumably Hugh de Maneby, since he was the successor as Northamptonshire sheriff to William de Lisle. A more damning indictment of general shrieval misbehaviour was then made by Matthew in connection with the introduction of the 1258 reforms to the shrieval office. On this matter he commented:

'The rapacity of the sheriffs was prudently and with good reason checked, for, mercenary beyond measure, they hitherto made a practice of extorting gifts from the inhabitants by any means, whether right or wrong, and supplanted each other in increasing their farms. They rode about with large retinues, and

²²Ibid., p. 663.

²³CIM, vol. I, 1219-1307, p. 123; J. R. Maddicott, 'Magna Carta and the local community 1215-1259', *Past and Present*, cii (1984), p. 35.

²⁴Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, vol. 5, pp. 715-16

*oppressed all the country people by their exactions, on manifold frivolous and unreasonable grounds. It was therefore decreed, that if any one, from that time forth, should secretly or openly give presents to them, the sheriffs, or any of them, for the sake of obtaining justice, or of impeding the due course of justice, unless such presents should consist of a moderate supply of food and drink, both the briber and the bribed should be severely punished.'*²⁵

How widespread such shrieval misbehaviour was is difficult to gauge from other sources. There are clear examples from the mid and late 1250s of instances of complaints against sheriffs and their behaviour. The fine rolls record cases of fines being levied on sheriffs for not obeying royal orders. For example, in October 1256, a number of sheriffs were amerced for not carrying out an order to distrain those men eligible to become knights²⁶. However, the most notable case of shrieval misbehaviour was that of Robert le Vavassur, the sheriff of Nottingham and Derby from April 1246 to May 1255. In early 1256, Robert was given a royal pardon, in exchange for payment of a 200m fine to the king, for trespasses made by himself and his men in lands held of the king for the time he was sheriff '*or other bailiff of the king*'. However, he still had to stand trial in the king's court touching trespasses committed against others than the king²⁷.

²⁵Ibid., p. 720.

²⁶C. 60/53, schedule attached to m. 3.

²⁷E. 371/20, m. 2; CPR, 1247-58, p. 459. He paid this sum off into the wardrobe with 20m of gold (E. 372/100, m. 13d).

Cases heard during the course of Hugh Bigod's eyre show examples of illegal exactions having been pursued by sheriffs prior to 1258. In Kent, such a case was heard concerning the former sheriff, Reginald of Cobham, who had raised a custom whereby presentments at the county court could only be made for murder and other misadventures if a fine was first made with himself. The resultant judgement was that such fines were no longer to be made²⁸. The two Surrey/ Sussex sheriffs between Easter 1255 to Michaelmas 1258, Geoffrey de Cruce and Gerard de Evington, had several complaints made against them for both unlawful exactions of money and for making a tourn in Wotton hundred which should not have been made²⁹. Admittedly, the great majority of sheriffs in office between 1255-58 did not have cases heard against them on Bigod's eyre which could imply that shrieval misbehaviour was restricted to a minority of cases. Although, since Bigod did not visit all the counties in the country, it is impossible to tell from the records of his eyre how widespread abuses of the shrieval office were³⁰. However, whether shrieval misbehaviour was widespread or not, the important point is that there was a perception, as demonstrated by the 1258-59 complaints and reforms and Matthew Paris's comments on sheriffs, that the shrieval office was being abused.

²⁸A. H. Hersey, *An Introduction to and an edition of the Hugh Bigod Eyre Rolls, June 1258-February 1259: PRO JUST 1/1187 and JUST 1/873* (Univ. of London PhD thesis, 1991), pp. 576, 604.

²⁹*Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 458, 459, 469, 474, 493.

³⁰E. F. Jacob, *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67* (Oxford, 1925), p. 43.

The impression gained from the exchequer documentary sources from the years 1255 to 1258 is that of the exchequer working at less than full effectiveness and efficiency. In the *communia* section of the memoranda rolls, there are frequent entries referring to sheriffs being ordered to distrain former sheriffs, under-sheriffs and bailiffs for arrears of their accounts from years past. In some cases these account arrears go back a considerable time. For example, the Hampshire sheriff, in the Michaelmas 1255 term, was asked to distrain the heirs of Matthew son of Herbert for the Sussex county increment from the twelfth year of Henry's reign (1227-8) when Matthew was sheriff of that county³¹. Alongside such entries, there are numerous cases of sheriffs being asked to inquire how much money former officials received during the tenure of their offices. For example, the Surrey/ Sussex sheriff was asked in the Michaelmas 1257 term to inquire into the debts that Robert le Sauvage and his bailiffs received during Robert's time as sheriff and then to make Robert's son, Richard, reply for them³². That there are so many cases similar to the above implies that the exchequer was not forcing local officials to discharge their debts in full soon after their tenure in office finished, i.e. the exchequer was taking several years in getting officials to account for their dues. Another aspect of this administrative inefficiency is demonstrated by the correspondence, recorded in the *Close Rolls*, between the king and the barons at the exchequer concerning the enrolment of sums in

³¹E. 159/29, m. 1.

³²E. 368/33, m. 1d.

the exchequer accounts of money paid into the wardrobe from previous years. For example, in February 1256, the king ordered the exchequer barons to record that Hugh de Mortimer paid £26 1m into the wardrobe from the issues of Eynford church in the 34th year of his reign (1249-50)³³. Such cases like this of delays in informing exchequer officials of money delivered into the wardrobe were frequent.

The above mentioned inability of the exchequer to force local officials to pay their debts within a short period after the end of their tenure in office was a cause of complaint to the reformers. Whilst this failure was not actually addressed in the reforms of 1258-9, it was one of the grievances raised by the reforming side before the French king at Amiens in January 1264. The reforming case presented then stated that:

*'Accordingly, very often, under force of necessity, the arrears of the sheriffs and other bailiffs, which should be paid immediately into the exchequer before the discharge from the account, are instead, on the receipt of some trivial payment from them, attorned for quite long periods or on the promise of some small sum annually, so that out of arrears of 400 or 500m or more they were attorned to pay 100s or 10m annually, to the great loss of the lord king.'*³⁴

The figures mentioned above by the reformers for the rate of annual payment of arrears were rather extreme cases. Repayment rates tended to be higher than 100s or 10m, though evidence suggests that the general complaint of the reformers was

³³*Close Rolls, 1254-56, p. 276.*

³⁴*DBM, p. 277.*

justified. The Trinity 1256 *communia* in the memoranda rolls ordered Gilbert de Cheyles to pay the arrears of his account as Lincoln sheriff off at £20 a year after two initial payments of 40m and 80m, a previous entry having put his arrears at £700 14s 6. 5d³⁵. William Heron, the previously mentioned Northumberland sheriff, was allowed, in February 1257, to pay off his £425 8s 10d arrears at 100m a year³⁶. Robert de Grendon, a former Salop/Stafford sheriff, in July 1257, was given the payment terms of £40 a year for the £484 he owed for account arrears³⁷.

An explanation for the failure of the exchequer to get local officials to discharge their accounts quickly could well lie in the problems that sheriffs were having in raising the money from their shires as demanded by the exchequer. Thus the higher values for increments above the county farms and the difficulties sheriffs were having in distraining for debts would help explain both the orders for enquiries into how much money certain sheriffs received from certain sources during their tenure, and why accounts were not being closed quickly. However, whilst this would provide a reason for the apparent exchequer inefficiency in gathering dues from sheriffs, it would also suggest that the king and exchequer were ignoring the problems being caused by such high increments, i.e. they were pursuing administrative policies that were unrealistic. This is perhaps borne out by the only reform to exchequer procedure that Henry attempted between 1255 to 1258, a reform that, not only from all appearances failed

³⁵E. 159/29, m. 3, 18.

³⁶C. 60/54, m. 9; E. 368/32, m. 12.

³⁷C. 60/54, m. 3.

comprehensively, but had nothing to do with sorting out the administrative mess at the exchequer.

This attempted reform concerned the attendance of sheriffs at the exchequer for the twice yearly *Adventi Vicecomitum*, and stemmed from a personal ruling made by Henry at the exchequer in the Michaelmas 1256 term. This provision stated that all the sheriffs should attend the two proffers on the day after Michaelmas and the day after the close of Easter ‘*in their own persons*’ as they were bound to do according to the ancient custom of the exchequer. Failure by a sheriff to come to the exchequer as demanded above was to result in the sheriff being amerced 100s for the first day of his absence, 100s for the second day, 100s for the third, 100s for the fourth, and on the fifth day he was to be amerced at the king's will. A similar demand was made of those local officials replying for cities, boroughs and other demesnes of the king not under the control of sheriffs, the only difference being that they were to be fined at the rate of 5m a day³⁸. This provision by the king was not unsimilar to the procedure and fines mentioned in Richard FitzNigel's *Dialogus de Scaccario* as the penalties for late attendance at the exchequer³⁹. The reason behind these demands

³⁸E. 368/32, m. 1d; Matthaei Parisiensis, *Chronica Majora*, vol. 5, pp. 588-89. Paris mentions this provision by the king, but states that the sheriffs were to be fined at 5m a day.

³⁹R. FitzNigel, *Dialogus de Scaccario De Necessariis Observantiis Scaccarii Dialogus qui vulgo dicitur Dialogus de Scaccario*, ed. C. Johnson (Oxford, 1983), p. 79-80. FitzNigel states that money fines were imposed only for the first two days, on the third day the sheriff's moveable property became

of the sheriffs and local officials is not clear. Certainly it is difficult to see how the king could have benefited financially from them. The only two explanations would appear to be that either the king felt that exchequer procedure should mirror '*ancient custom*' in its dealings with local officials or that by forcing sheriffs to attend the proffers in person, it would enable the crown and exchequer to exert closer personal supervision over the sheriffs. It is possible that this Michaelmas 1256 demand for shrieval attendance at the proffers and the resultant fines proposed for late attendance was a development of a policy of fining sheriffs for late attendance for audits of their accounts. The Michaelmas 1255 to Trinity 1256 memoranda roll records cases of sheriffs being fined or statements that they will be fined for late attendance for the audits of their shire accounts. Such references are made to the Surrey/ Sussex sheriff Geoffrey de Cruce and to the Lincoln sheriff Gilbert de Cheyles⁴⁰.

The implementation of the policy of forcing sheriffs to attend the proffers in person was not a success. The Lincoln and Buckingham/ Bedford sheriffs were noted on the Michaelmas 1256 to Trinity 1257 memoranda roll as not appearing in person

forfeit to the king, and on the forth day the sheriff was judged to be at the king's mercy.

⁴⁰E. 159/29, m. 2, 11.

at the exchequer on the day after the close of Easter 1257⁴¹, though it is the lists of shrieval attendance at the proffers, i.e. the *Adventi Vicecomitum*, that most clearly show what a failure this reform was. The three proffers prior to Henry's provision, those of Michaelmas 1255, Easter 1256 and Michaelmas 1256, record attendances of six, ten, and eight sheriffs in person respectively⁴². Following the provision, this situation did not improve at all with only eight sheriffs attending the Easter 1257 proffer in person, seven the Michaelmas 1257 and nine the Easter 1258⁴³. Therefore, Henry's attempts at forcing sheriffs into attending the proffers in person was a complete failure with no improvement being seen at all.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the above suggest a rather damning indictment of Henry's financial administration. The only reform attempted by the king during this 1255-58 period was not only unsuccessful but also failed to address the problems of the delayed discharge of local officials from their accounts and the general administrative mess that the exchequer appears to have been in at this time. It is also questionable whether the exchequer's authority was strong enough to force sheriffs into carrying out the orders issued by the exchequer's officials. The above mentioned failed reform could thus possibly suggest that the sheriffs did not bother to obey the

⁴¹E. 368/32, m. 13d. It states here that neither of these two sheriffs appeared at the exchequer on the first, second and third days after the close of Easter.

⁴²E. 159/29, m. 30, 31; E. 368/32, m. 32.

⁴³E. 368/32, m. 32; E. 368/33, m. 28, 29.

demands for personal attendance at the exchequer. What is very noticeable in the *communia* sections of the memoranda rolls is how often the exchequer had to re-iterate its orders to local officials about clearing up outstanding debts and accounts. For example, there are references in each of the three yearly memoranda rolls from Michaelmas 1255 to Trinity 1258 to orders to the Nottingham/ Derby sheriff to inquire into and distrain debts still due from Robert le Vavassur's tenure as sheriff of these two counties⁴⁴. These orders concerning Robert's account were still being repeated, in Michaelmas 1258, after the reform movement had got under way⁴⁵. Similarly, orders concerning the collection of arrears pertaining to Gilbert de Cheyles and Robert de Grendon were being repeated over and over again⁴⁶. In general, it appears that in the majority of cases, commands to distrain for account arrears were repeated at least once. This would indicate either that the exchequer's orders were not immediately acted upon in the localities or that it was difficult for local officials to collect their dues. This latter point would help partly explain why Gilbert de Cheyles and Robert de Grendon were given favourable terms for the payment of their account arrears, i.e. difficulty over collecting these arrears meant that it was impossible for them to discharge their accounts in full so soon after the end of their tenures in office.

Thus by the time of the outbreak of opposition to Henry in the spring of 1258, the financial administration of the

⁴⁴E. 159/29, m. 7d; E. 368/32, m. 17; E. 368/33, m. 16d.

⁴⁵E. 368/34, m. 3.

⁴⁶E. 159/29, m. 3, 6d, 7, 8, 18; E. 368/32, m. 15, 17d, 18; E. 368/33, m. 7, 10, 13.

crown was less than effective in distraining for debts owed to the crown, with it taking several years in certain cases for shrieval accounts to be closed. Whether one sees the reason for this being lax administrative control over local officials, or the difficulty in collecting the crown's dues in the localities, it is clear that the administrative apparatus for the crown's revenue raising activities needed to be improved and modified.

As has been shown, by early 1258 the shrieval office was in need of reform. Thus the legislation introduced in 1258 provided for changes in the administration of the shrieval office. These changes, consisting of local sheriffs having to render for variable profits above the county farm instead of fixed increments, of salary allowances to sheriffs for the keeping of their counties, of yearly tenure of the shrieval office and of the other reforms outlined previously, therefore reflected a means of attempting to reduce local antagonism towards the demands made of and by the sheriffs. By reducing the length of time an individual could spend in the sheriff's office and by forcing him to account for all revenue raised above the farm, in return for a salary in lieu of any money raised above the increment, it was hoped that the corruption and abuse of the office could be reduced.

Analysis of the Reforms

The first area of reform to be examined is that concerned with the yearly tenure of sheriffs in their office, a demand made by both the Provisions of Oxford, with its statement that no one is

to be a '*sheriff for more than one year at a time*'⁴⁷, and the Ordinance of the Sheriffs, which mentions that '*neither sheriff nor any other, shall remain in his office for more than one year*'⁴⁸. The table below, based on those accounts for the counties on the pipe rolls⁴⁹, records the frequency of shrieval change in the shires:-

Financial Year	Change	No Change	Change during Year
Mich. 1256-57	6	13	5
Mich. 1257-58	7	16	1
Mich. 1258-59	16	5	3
Mich. 1259-60	18	1 ⁵⁰	5
Mich. 1260-61	1	10	13

The figures in the 'change' category refer to sheriffs who, for that financial year, were different to those of the previous year; those in the 'no change' category are the number of sheriffs of that year that had accounted for the previous year as well; whilst those in the final category refer to a change of sheriff occurring during the course of the year (in all these cases the sheriff who initially had accounted for the first part of the year had accounted for the previous year or the final part of that previous year). From the table, it is shown that, prior to

⁴⁷DBM, p. 109

⁴⁸DBM, p. 123

⁴⁹E. 372/101-105.

⁵⁰The only county not to have a new sheriff was Worcester, which was held by William de Beauchamp as an hereditary office.

Michaelmas 1258, in the majority of cases, sheriffs were not restricted to a yearly tenure of office. Of these counties, 8 had the same sheriff accounting for their issues for the whole period Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258⁵¹. It was in the Autumn of 1258 that a widespread change of sheriffs was carried out by the reformers for the financial year Michaelmas 1258-59 (as reflected in the table)⁵². This was followed by a fresh set of appointments at the end of that financial year at Michaelmas 1259, with only the one county not having a change of sheriff either at the start of the year or during the course of the Michaelmas 1259-60 financial year. Therefore, it can be seen that for the two years following the introduction of reform, the policy of yearly tenure of the shrieval office was pursued more or less fully by the reformers. However, once the national political situation became more unstable, as it did from Spring 1260, then this branch of reform seems to have been dropped. Hence, there was only one county that had a change of sheriff at Michaelmas 1260. It was not until the middle of 1261, with Henry III's regaining of effective power and overthrowing the reform process, that a wholesale change of sheriffs occurred again: this being a result of Henry placing his

⁵¹These being Wiltshire, Lancashire, Norfolk/ Suffolk, Nottingham/ Derby, York, Worcester, Cumberland and Oxford/Berkshire.

⁵²E. 371/22, m. 12; *CPR, 1247-58*, p. 655. The *Patent Rolls* record 19 sheriffs being appointed in October and November 1258. Two of these appointed sheriffs, Ralph Haregod for Hampshire and Gilbert Talebot for Hereford, did not subsequently account on the Michaelmas 1258-59 pipe roll, the accounts for their counties being presented by others, whilst not all the appointments made were for new sheriffs.

own nominated men into the shrieval office in a bid to control the localities.

There occurred one minor change after 1258 concerning the accession of sheriffs into office which went unrecorded in the reforming demands and decrees. This was the ceasing of the payment of fines by sheriffs to hold their office. In the years prior to 1258, there had been cases of sheriffs having to pay a fine in gold to the king for having the shrieval office. These fines went unmentioned on the pipe rolls in the accounts for the shire farms and increments of the sheriffs concerned. Instead, these gold fines were recorded on the originalia and fine rolls as having been paid into the wardrobe, and were thus presumably one of the means used by Henry to build up his gold treasure. The fines levied in this manner were of no standard value, varying from 1m of gold up to 3m of gold, and were not levied on all the shrieval appointments mentioned on these two rolls. Six sheriffs made such fines for 1255-6⁵³, with another four recorded for 1256-7⁵⁴. No new fines were recorded on the fine and originalia rolls for 1257-8, the three such fines mentioned appear to refer to fines made previously by the three sheriffs named⁵⁵. The total value of these gold fines levied after Michaelmas 1255 is small, totalling only 13m gold (equivalent to 130m silver), and therefore it is perhaps not surprising that no attention was paid to the levying of these fines in the reforms of 1258-9. Nonetheless the abolition of these fines was clearly a reform designed to lesson the

⁵³C. 60/53, m. 1, 2, 13, 22; E. 371/20, m. 5.

⁵⁴C. 60/54, m. 1, 5, 6, 7.

⁵⁵E. 371/22, m. 13, 14.

financial pressure on the sheriff and thus, by extension, on those under his control.

The method of selecting sheriffs for the years of reform is not totally clear. Certainly, the king had little or no say in such appointments since, in the Spring of 1261, he had complained of the council appointing officials not known to himself⁵⁶. This complaint had elicited the reply from the council that it was the exchequer, and not the council, that appointed officials⁵⁷. The proposed extent of the exchequer's control over the selection of officials had been made clear, in the Autumn of 1259, in the Provisions of Westminster. The relevant provision on this matter was that:

'The chief justiciar, the treasurer, Sir Henry de Bath, Sir Roger de Thurkelby, and the barons of the exchequer shall decide now, this year, which sound loyal and wise men shall be sheriffs for the present year. And they shall be vavassors of the same counties. And in preparation for the next year, at the last county court before Michaelmas [29 September], let four sound and loyal men, who will be useful in that office, both to the king and to the county, be elected in full county court, and let them present themselves to the exchequer at Michaelmas; and the barons will select the best men in their opinion.' ⁵⁸

This suggests that, for 1259-60, the Barons of the Exchequer were to choose the sheriffs, whilst the 1260-61 sheriffs

⁵⁶DBM, p. 225.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 225.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 155

were to be selected by the Barons from four nominees chosen by each county. This proposed procedure for 1260-61 marked a change from the method usually employed before 1258, when shrieval appointments were made in the exchequer on the sole authority of the King, by his personal choice or by that of his exchequer officials⁵⁹. Instead, this reform proposed that local influence, i.e. the wishes of the county knights and freeholders, would play an important part in influencing the appointment of sheriffs.

However, it is likely that those sheriffs chosen for office for both the years 1258-59 and 1259-60 had reflected a degree of local influence in their selection. The reforms issued in 1258 do not state how the sheriffs were selected to hold office from Michaelmas 1258. The first appointments to shrieval offices for the 1258-59 year, those of David de Jarpenvill to Surrey/Sussex and Robert Basset to Northamptonshire, were made in August 1258 and make no reference to any local influence in the way they were chosen⁶⁰, whilst those sheriffs chosen in the Michaelmas 1258 term to serve as the 1258-59 sheriffs only have references to their being appointed upon the provision and advice of the magnates⁶¹. However, as E. F. Jacob and R. F. Treharne have pointed out in their studies of the reforms of this period, evidence from early 1259 suggests local knights choosing their sheriff. The

⁵⁹R. F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-1263* (Manchester, 1971), p. 183

⁶⁰C. 60/55, m. 3; E. 371/22, m. 9. However, Robert did not subsequently serve as the Northants sheriff.

⁶¹E. 368/34, mm. 3d, 4.

case that they both quote is from the Hilary *communia* on the 1258-59 memoranda roll and concerns William Butler, Geoffrey Cheetham, William Furness, and Alan of Windle, as having elected William Butler as the Lancashire sheriff⁶². William then subsequently accounted at the exchequer as the custodial sheriff for the issues of Lancashire for the period Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259⁶³. Treharne also quotes a second case involving Hampshire knights choosing John de St. Valery as their sheriff, as a result of the previously selected sheriff, Ralph de Harengod, having fallen ill⁶⁴. In addition, it is noticeable that 16 of the 24 sheriffs serving in office for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 had been selected as one of the four local knights in each county chosen to make enquiries into grievances in the localities as demanded by the Provisions of Oxford⁶⁵. This shows that local sheriffs were being placed into office for the 1258-59 year, though it is less clear what the manner of their election as sheriff was. However, it does suggest that the above mentioned reform in the Provisions of Westminster for the election of the 1260-61 sheriffs was possibly being used in late 1258 for the selection of the 1258-59 sheriffs. In which case, it would imply that the article in the Provisions of Westminster concerning the election of

⁶²Jacob, *Studies*, p. 50; Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 205-6; E. 368/34, m. 6.

⁶³E. 372/104, m. 25.

⁶⁴Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 206. However, according to the pipe roll accounts, John never served as Hampshire sheriff.

⁶⁵*DBM*, p. 99; *CPR*, 1247-58, p. 645-649. A 17th sheriff, Ralph de Harengod, had been elected as one of the knights for Hampshire. However, due to illness, he never served as sheriff.

sheriffs was simply reiterating in statute form a practice that was already being pursued.

Regarding the choice of the 1259-60 sheriffs, Treharne states that '*it seems clear that the sheriffs of 1259-60 were elected by panels of 4 knights from each county, the knights being elected in the county courts, and then coming to the Exchequer to choose the sheriff upon oath taken before the barons of the Exchequer, who then appointed the man so chosen for each county*'⁶⁶. He bases this conclusion on an entry for early November 1259 on the Michaelmas 1259 to Trinity 1260 memoranda roll. This entry ordered the 1258-59 sheriffs to come to the exchequer along with four knights of their respective counties to hear and do the king's commands to both the sheriffs and knights⁶⁷: 17 sheriffs were commanded to come to the exchequer in November with their knights, and 5 other sheriffs (those for Yorkshire, Cumberland, Lancashire, Northumberland and Devon) were ordered to come in January. However, it cannot be demonstrated that the new 1259-60 sheriffs were chosen by these local knights since there is no specific mention of that fact. Instead, it can only be assumed to have been the case in that the appointments of the 1259-60 sheriffs noted on the memoranda rolls all occur in the Michaelmas 1259 *communia* and the Hilary 1260 *communia* after the initial order instructing the sheriffs and four knights of each county to come to the exchequer. Similarly, the first dating of a new shrieval appointment for 1259-60

⁶⁶Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 207.

⁶⁷E. 368/35, m. 5; Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 207; Jacob, *Studies*, p. 50-51.

recorded on the fine rolls is for 8th December 1259 and concerns the appointment of John de Cobbeham as Kent sheriff⁶⁸, the four Kent knights presumably having appeared at the exchequer in the previous month as demanded by the above mentioned memoranda roll entry. Along the same lines, the appointments of Thomas son of Michael to Northumberland and of John de Oketon to Yorkshire were made on the 22nd and the 27th January 1260 respectively⁶⁹, the knights of these counties having been ordered to appear at the exchequer on January 14th. Therefore it appears that there is a correlation between the four knights of each county appearing at the exchequer and the appointment of sheriffs, in that sheriffs were appointed following the attendance of the knights at the exchequer. This possibly suggests a role for local influence in the selection of sheriffs.

However, for the selection of the Michaelmas 1260 to Michaelmas 1261 sheriffs, the situation changes. The demands of the Provisions of Westminster concerning the appointment of sheriffs for this year did not come into effect. As can be seen from the previously quoted table of new shrieval appointments to office, only one new sheriff was installed in office at Michaelmas 1260. The reasons for this are not clear from the exchequer evidence and thus it can only be assumed that this failure to carry out the selection of new sheriffs was a result of the changing political situation. The momentum of the reform movement had been lessened through 1260, with both the royalist faction in the Council becoming dominant over the reformers and with the

⁶⁸C. 60/57, m. 10.

⁶⁹E. 368/35, m. 7d, 8d.

partial eclipse of Simon de Montfort⁷⁰. In addition to this, the Autumn of 1260 had seen changes in three of the most important administrative posts. On 18th October, Nicholas of Ely became Chancellor, taking over from Henry de Wingham⁷¹, whilst around the same time Hugh Bigod was succeeded as Justiciar by Hugh Despenser and John de Caux, abbot of Peterborough, became the Treasurer, replacing John of Crakehall who had recently died⁷². Therefore, it is possible that, amidst this administrative change and the reluctance of a royalist dominated Council to further reform, the Provisions of Westminster's demands regarding the choice of sheriffs for 1260-61 was overlooked⁷³.

The major change proposed by the reformers to the office of sheriff concerned the terms on which sheriffs were to account at the exchequer for the issues of their counties. From Michaelmas 1258, the system of sheriffs rendering for fixed increments above the county farm was dropped and in its place, sheriffs were to account for all money raised above the county farm. This 'custodial' system of accounting had its origins in the reign of King John and had been used sporadically for certain

⁷⁰Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 241-44.

⁷¹*Close Rolls*, 1259-61, p. 130; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 97.

⁷²Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 244-45.

⁷³J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 202. Maddicott notes that this failure to change the sheriffs can be seen in the light of the modification to the reform programme which was taking place at this time and which freed the magnates from certain controls imposed upon them by the Provisions of Oxford and Westminster.

periods in the years since. It was first applied by John in 1204, as part of a bid to extract more revenue from the counties, when the majority of sherifffdoms were placed under custodians, who were to answer for all the issues of their shires and account for variable profits above the shire farms⁷⁴. The first issue of Magna Carta, in clause twenty-five, forbade both increments by name and profits by implication as it stated that the shires were to be held '*at the ancient farm*'⁷⁵. However, this clause was omitted from subsequent issues of the charter thus allowing the regency government, after Hubert de Burgh had gained ascendancy over the government with the January 1224 shrieval changes, to reintroduce the custodian system with profits being demanded from nearly every shire⁷⁶. From Michaelmas 1229 ten sheriffs ceased to be custodians and answered annually instead for fixed increments in place of variable profits, leaving only five sherifffdoms under custodians⁷⁷. The next widespread use of custodial sheriffs, and the last before 1258, came about in 1236 through a political revolution at court which broke the curial hold on sherifffdoms. A general re-imposition of profits was introduced which lasted until Michaelmas 1240⁷⁸. At this date the council changed policy abandoning the custodial system in the shires and returning the counties into the hands of farmers, who henceforth

⁷⁴Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff', p. 7; B. E. Harris, 'King John and the Sheriffs' Farms', *EHR*, lxxix (1964), pp. 532-542.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, p. 10; Stacey, *Politics*, p. 51.

⁷⁷Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff', pp. 10-11.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 16-19.

answered for a fixed profit (increment) beyond the shire farms, based on the approximate level of the sheriffs' receipts during the preceding four years⁷⁹. It was this system of fixed increments above the county farm that continued until the outbreak of reform in 1258.

As regards the implementation of this reforming policy connected with the change in the terms on which the sheriffs held office, it can be shown that this was carried out almost comprehensively after Michaelmas 1258. The pipe roll account for the financial year following the barons gaining control over the government administration, i.e. Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259, records at the top of each county account whether the sheriff of the county being audited was rendering at farm or as a custodian (*'ut custos'*)⁸⁰. Of the twenty four counties examined, twenty had sheriffs stated who acted as custodians. Two have no statement to that effect but from the accounts it can be seen that the sheriffs were acting as custodians⁸¹. Two counties did not render for variable profits at all (these being Worcestershire and London/ Middlesex, which traditionally did not render a fixed increment). The terminology used in the pipe rolls for describing revenue raised above the farm in these years

⁷⁹Stacey, *Politics*, p. 61.

⁸⁰The bulk of the county accounts for the Michaelmas 1258-59 financial year lie in E. 372/103 but three of the accounts were not rendered until the following financial year (these being Wiltshire, Lancashire and Buckingham and Bedford) and are thus contained in E372/104.

⁸¹E. 372/103, mm. 29, 35. These two accounts being for Cumberland and for Essex/ Hertfordshire.

is the same for both increments and variable profits, i.e. the words '*proficuum comitatus*' are used to describe both forms of accounting, though it is obvious from the amounts of money being accounted for and the use of the term '*ut custos*' that variable profits were being levied from the counties.

However, this policy of custodial sheriffs was dropped after being in force for one year, with all the counties returning to a fixed farm and increment scheme either at the beginning of the financial year starting at Michaelmas 1259 or during the course of that year. The reason for the dropping of this policy of custodial sheriffs in all probability lies in the relative failure of the scheme between its introduction in Michaelmas 1258 and the start of the following financial year in Michaelmas 1259. This explanation also seems to have been the case when the previous scheme of custodial sheriffs had been dropped in Michaelmas 1240, since the gross receipts from the shire issues had declined by more than 15 per cent in the years between 1238 to 1240⁸². Certainly it can be seen when comparing the financial year Michaelmas 1258-59, when the custodial scheme of accounting was in place, with the financial years either side of it that a major change for the worse in the amount of money for which the sheriffs were liable at the exchequer occurred. The table below shows the changes:-

Financial Year	Accounting Procedure	Liable	Increment/Profit
Mich. 1255-56	Fixed Increment	£2800	
Mich. 1256-57	Fixed Increment	£2814	10s 1. 5d

⁸²Stacey, *Politics*, p. 61.

Mich. 1257-58 ⁸³	Fixed Increment	£2790		
Mich. 1258-59 ⁸⁴	Variable Profit	£1084	18s	4. 5d
Mich. 1259-60 ⁸⁵	Fixed Increment	£2008		

⁸³For Salop/ Staffs, the increment figure of 190m has been used which is based upon the Michaelmas 1256-57 figure (The Michaelmas 1257-58 increment does not appear on the pipe rolls until Edward I's reign).

⁸⁴The sum for Oxford/ Berkshire is for the last three quarters of the financial year since there is no sum mentioned for the first quarter. The Wiltshire Account records 25m as being rendered for the first quarter (when it was held at farm), but the figure for the last three quarters of the year also contains the figures for the first quarter of Michaelmas 1259-60. Therefore, I have taken three quarters of this figure and added the above 25m to get the Wiltshire figure for Michaelmas 1258-59 financial year.

⁸⁵The Salop/ Staffs figure is only for the last three quarters of the year since no sum has been mentioned for the first quarter of the year. Cumberland has £20 rendered for the second half of the year but £25 10d for the first half. This difference could be explained by the fact that the sheriff for the first half year was the same sheriff as for Michaelmas 1258-59 and could still have been rendering '*ut custos*' (though it does not say whether this is the case in the accounts for Michaelmas 1259-60). A figure of 175m has been given to York for the second half of the year. This is since the sheriff rendered a sum of 350m increment for Easter 1260 to Easter 1261, this sum being divided in two to give the increment for the second half of this 1259-60 financial year. The Norfolk/ Suffolk figure is for the last three quarters of the year as no sum is mentioned for the first quarter when the county was held '*ut custos*'. The Wiltshire account was '*ut custos*' for the first quarter (see above footnote section for how the figure for this quarter has been determined).

Mich. 1260-61⁸⁶ Fixed Increment £2125 16s 8d

A fixed increment system was in general use for the year Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1260, though a few counties had sheriffs continuing to render for variable profits in the first quarter of the year before switching back to accounting at farm as was the case before Michaelmas 1258. It must be stressed here that the figures in the table show the total amount of money for which the sheriffs were liable to account for at the Exchequer, not the amount of money actually paid in⁸⁷.

It can thus be seen that the change from a fixed increment scheme for Michaelmas 1257-58 to accounting for variable profit for Michaelmas 1258-59 led to a collapse in the amount of money for which the sheriffs were liable at the exchequer. In twenty counties the variable profits were lower than the fixed increments of the previous year. Of these, seven counties - Lincoln, Somerset/ Dorset, Kent, London/ Middlesex, Worcester, Essex/ Herts and Cambridge/ Huntingdon - accounted for no profits at all for Michaelmas 1258-59. Only two counties, Hereford and Warwick/ Leicester, accounted for profit sums that were higher for Michaelmas 1258-59 as compared to their fixed increments for Michaelmas 1257-58.

The figures from the above table do not show the complete picture of the collapse of royal revenue received from

⁸⁶No recorded increment for the last half of the year for Nottingham/ Derby has been traced.

⁸⁷These totals have been calculated on the basis of the liable increment figures quoted in the pipe rolls.

the county farms and increments/ profits. Of the counties that failed to provide a variable profit for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259, five of them, all of which had traditionally answered for fixed increments above the county farm, failed to raise enough money to cover the basic county farm. Four of these counties - Essex/ Herts, Lincoln, Somerset/ Dorset and Kent - have their sheriffs' county accounts (the *particuli proficui*) remaining, in which the sheriffs detailed the sources and amounts of the revenue they raised towards the shire farms. The shortfall in revenue beneath the county farm is relatively small in the case of Somerset/ Dorset - only £14 2s⁸⁸. However, in the other three shires the shortfall is quite sizeable - £121 2s 3. 5d for Essex/ Herts⁸⁹, £75 8s 3d for Lincoln⁹⁰ and £88 16s 1d for Kent⁹¹. These figures, with the exception of Essex/ Hertford, are also mentioned on the Michaelmas 1259 to Trinity 1260 memoranda roll at the bottom of the respective county accounts⁹², along with a figure of £23 16s 11d for the shortfall in the county farm for Cambridge/ Huntingdon⁹³. Thus an additional £320 can be added to the amount of revenue lost to the exchequer by the introduction of the variable profit scheme.

The return back to fixed increments in Michaelmas 1259 was not marked by a return to the increment values before

⁸⁸E. 370/6/5, m. 4-5.

⁸⁹E. 370/5/30, m. 11.

⁹⁰E. 370/5/44, m. 4.

⁹¹E. 370/5/37, m. 6.

⁹²E. 368/35, m. 31, 33, 34.

⁹³E. 368/35, m. 20.

the reform period. Instead there were a large number of changes. Of the twenty counties that had rendered lower 1258-59 profits, as compared to their 1257-58 fixed increments, 17 were given lower increment figures for the 1259-60 financial year as compared to their 1257-58 increment totals. Three counties - Gloucester, Wiltshire and Huntingdon/ Cambridge - retained their pre reform increment figures⁹⁴, whilst, of the two counties with higher 1258-59 profit figures (as compared to the 1257-58 increments), Hereford had its 1259-60 increment increased and Warwick/ Leicester had its increment for the same year decreased from the 1257-58 levels.

The dominant conclusion to be made from the above figures and changes is that the introduction of the custodial scheme of administering the counties' revenue was unsuccessful, the fact that the scheme was dropped after only one year being a testament to its failure. The drop in money between Michaelmas 1257-58 and Michaelmas 1259-60, for which the sheriffs were liable at the exchequer for their farms/ increments, can perhaps be seen to bear out some of Henry III's complaints against the reforming regime in 1261. His statements that royal receipts and the revenues of his lands and exchequer were diminished from what they formerly were⁹⁵, and that nothing was being returned

⁹⁴The Wiltshire figure is based on the last three quarters of the Michaelmas 1259-60 increment figure being equal to the same period in Michaelmas 1257-58 (the first quarter of Michaelmas 1259-60 being held '*ut custos*').

⁹⁵*DBM*, p. 213.

from the counties as it used to be⁹⁶, seem to be borne out by the figures.

The fall in profits above the county farm, and the failure in five cases to even raise enough money to cover the basic farm, can be interpreted as showing how carefully the sheriffs had to tread following the introduction of the reform programme. Various explanations for such behaviour on the part of the sheriffs may be canvassed. Firstly, it would suggest that the sheriffs' failure to raise revenue was partly because they were powerless against the leading members of the magnate regime. This line of argument was taken by Henry III in 1261 when he stated that the royal rights had been encroached upon, hence resulting in losses to himself, and that appointed officials did not dare to enter the lands of council members or do anything which affected council members⁹⁷. Given that shrieval authority in the counties would have been weakened by both the policy of yearly tenure in office and the use of local sheriffs (as opposed to curial sheriffs), Henry's argument would appear to have some validity. Secondly, it can also be suggested that, through the fear of legal investigation, the sheriffs were hesitant in raising revenue in ways which might have provoked complaints to the justiciar. However, it is difficult to provide evidence backing this up since no *particuli proficui* exist for years in this period in which the sheriffs accounted for the farm and fixed increment, and hence a comparison of the sources and amounts of revenue cannot be achieved.

⁹⁶DBM, p. 221-3.

⁹⁷DBM, pp. 221-3, 239.

The above mentioned premise that sheriffs were treading more carefully in the pursuit of their duties and revenue raising methods can possibly be seen in the case of Lincolnshire. As has been mentioned, the Lincolnshire sheriff for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259, William de Engelby, failed to raise any variable profit above the farm, falling short of even covering the basic county farm by some considerable margin. This compares very unfavourably to the revenue raised for a very brief period of variable profit accounting which occurred for this county in the last quarter of the financial year Michaelmas 1256-57, i.e. the Trinity 1257 to Michaelmas 1257 term. John de Cokerinton, the sheriff for this period, accounted for £64 10s 1. 5d of variable profit which was proportionately an increase on the fixed increment rendered for the first three quarters of the year and also on the increment for the subsequent year⁹⁸. Any meaningful comparison between what happened in this quarter and after Michaelmas 1258 is difficult to reach because the sheriff's accounts for the income raised (the *particuli proficui*) do not remain for this Trinity to Michaelmas 1257 term and therefore revenue sources cannot be compared, whilst the short time span of custodial accounting for this quarter in 1257 hinders any adequate analysis. However, it does raise some interesting considerations. As no variable profit was generated for the financial year after Michaelmas 1258, the suggestion is there that William de Engelby, in his tenure as sheriff, had to be much more

⁹⁸E. 372/101, m. 21. William de Legherton, the sheriff for the first three quarters of Michaelmas 1256-57, had rendered £170 for the county increment which equates to a quarterly total of £56 1m.

careful in the administration of his office. It is likely that this was the case considering some of the problems that previous sheriffs of Lincolnshire had faced as regards raising income. There had been disputes over the past twenty years over the holding of local courts by sheriffs, which concerned how many sessions should be held yearly and whether a court could last more than a day. In 1237 John de Bayouse, a powerful Lincolnshire knight, was accused of causing great financial loss to the crown by appearing at hundred and wapentake courts in the county and prohibiting attendance there, except on two occasions a year⁹⁹. Fifteen years later, in 1252, Henry III ruled that the county court could sit for two days if necessary following a dispute over the court only having sat for one day¹⁰⁰. Then, in the memoranda roll for 1256-57, the former sheriff Gilbert de Cheyles is noted as having suffered losses during his period in office as a result of the bishop of Lincoln prohibiting wapentakes and riding courts¹⁰¹. An entry in the *Close Rolls* from June 1256 states that Gilbert was to be allowed, in his account as Lincoln sheriff, damages and injuries sustained through these actions of the Bishop of Lincoln¹⁰². It is possible that these problems in Lincolnshire might account for why Gilbert de Cheyle was given such favourable terms for the payment of his account arrears and why there are so many entries in the memoranda rolls concerning the distraint for these arrears. Similar problems concerning the sheriff's tourn are also

⁹⁹Maddicott, 'Magna Carta', p. 35.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁰¹E. 368/32, m. 18d; Maddicott, 'Magna Carta', p. 35.

¹⁰²*Close Rolls, 1254-56*, p. 422-23.

highlighted in the case of John le Moyne, a former sheriff of Cambridgeshire. He had complained in 1254 to the king that he could not cover his county increment without the sale or mortgage of his lands, and was then later complained against for levying uncustomary sums in his tourn¹⁰³. These cases not only show examples of local dissatisfaction with shrieval administration but also demonstrate how touchy local society could be about defending its rights and privileges.

This disquiet of local society about the revenue raising methods of sheriffs and their use of the tourn had been partly highlighted in the Petition of the Barons of May 1258 with its complaints about arbitrary amercements at the tourn¹⁰⁴. Attempts to remedy these grievances were then subsequently included in the reform process. The Provisions of Oxford had provided a means for complaining about shrieval misbehaviour through the order for four knights in each county to make inquiries into grievances, with the complaints to be heard by Hugh Bigod on his eyre, whilst the Ordinance of Sheriffs had stated the behaviour expected of a sheriff¹⁰⁵. Therefore, the custodial sheriffs introduced in 1258 were subject to examination and restrictions which made their situation quite different from that of the sheriffs in the years leading up to reform. The dubious ways in which pre-1258 sheriffs had extracted income to cover their liable fixed increments and to secure private profit were thus not available to the sheriffs appointed in the era of reform.

¹⁰³Maddicott, 'Magna Carta', p. 44.

¹⁰⁴*DBM*, p. 85.

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 99, 119-23.

Given this situation, it is perhaps not surprising that the variable profits realised between Michaelmas 1258 and Michaelmas 1259 were lower than the fixed increments of previous years.

Another reason concerning the fall in receipts over and above the county farm during the custodial period could lie in the non-reporting of income by sheriffs. Whilst this was not a problem under a system of fixed increments since sheriffs did not have to present accounts of all the income they raised, it was a possibility under a custodial system. If in fact the sheriffs between Michaelmas 1258 and Michaelmas 1259 were not declaring all their receipts, and hence deriving private profit from their offices in addition to any salary allowance promised to them, then there was little point in the government continuing with the experiment of variable profits¹⁰⁶.

Conclusions from this apparent collapse in the amount of money for which sheriffs were liable at the Exchequer for their county must be treated carefully. It's relevance to the King's complaints about diminishing revenues is somewhat lessened by the fact that the receipt rolls for this period show an increase in the amount of money coming into the lower Exchequer¹⁰⁷, whilst an examination of the cash payments from county farms and increments/ variable profits into the exchequer and wardrobe and

¹⁰⁶R. C. Stacey makes this point about a possible reason for the dropping of custodial sheriffs in 1240 (Stacey, *Politics*, p. 62).

¹⁰⁷R. J. Whitwell, 'The Revenue and Expenditure of England under Henry III', *EHR*, xviii (1903), p. 710. A more detailed analysis of income paid into the exchequer during the years of reform is made in the next chapter.

accounted on the pipe rolls show an opposing picture from Michaelmas 1258.

It is notable that, although the financial years Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261 have lower figures for liable fixed increments/variable profits as compared to Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258, the amount of cash which was audited as having been paid into the Exchequer and Wardrobe in these three latter years, and whose source was clearly marked as being from the shrieval farm and the associated fixed increments/ variable profits goes up. The figures for such cash payments into the Exchequer and wardrobe from this source are as follows¹⁰⁸:-

Financial Year	Cash Paid into Exch./Ward ¹⁰⁹
Mich. 1255-56	£1101 10s 3d
Mich. 1256-57	£1104 10s 8. 5d
Mich. 1257-58	£1235 12s 11d
Mich. 1258-59	£1538
Mich. 1259-60	£1687

¹⁰⁸Only those payments on the pipe rolls that clearly belong to this category of revenue have been included in the tables. Occasionally the remainder of a shrieval farm/ profit for which a sheriff is liable is lumped with other debts and then a payment made. Such entries have been excluded from the figures quoted. However, these exclusions do not affect these sums in any notable way.

¹⁰⁹The adjusted figure from the revenue tables for shire issues has been quoted here.

Mich. 1260-61

£1740

From the table it appears that the years of the baronial control of the royal administration see an increase in cash receipts from the shrieval farm and the increments/ variable profits as audited on the pipe rolls. This perhaps suggests that a policy involving a far more vigorous collection of outstanding sums due for the shire issues was being pursued by the reformers. However, not too much should be read into these figures since the pre-Michaelmas 1258 figures are lower mainly because of more credit allowances against the sheriffs' farms and fixed increments for these years as compared to those years after Michaelmas 1258, hence depressing the amount of cash that the sheriffs needed to pay to be quit of their dues. The reason for this change in the value of credit allowances lies with the change in monetary grants that were being given to Simon de Montfort. Prior to Michaelmas 1258, de Montfort had been receiving £400 a year from the shire issues of Nottingham/ Derby, Oxford/ Berkshire, Warwick/ Leicester and Wiltshire (this £400 sum being given as a credit allowance to the sheriffs of these four counties). This sum had been paid to de Montfort in lieu of an equivalent amount of land to that yearly value which had been promised to him by the king. However, in July 1259, de Montfort was granted this £400 out of the farms of several demesne manors and thus this payment by the sheriffs of these four counties stopped at

Easter 1259¹¹⁰. Thus, although £200 was paid out of these shire issues for the Michaelmas 1258-Michaelmas 1259 year, the payments to de Montfort ceased the following year.

However, whilst the stopping of the grant to de Montfort accounts for most of the discrepancy between the figures in the table, there is other evidence that could suggest a more vigorous collection of shire issues was being pursued. This evidence concerns the number of sheriffs, either past or present, who were audited as paying money from this revenue source into the Exchequer or into the King's wardrobe. From the pipe rolls, sixteen sheriffs were audited as paying cash in quittance or part payment of their debts for the shrieval farm and increment of their period in office in the year Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1256. In the following two years, Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1258, this decreased to nine and ten sheriffs respectively. However, for the three years following the outbreak of reform, i.e. Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261, the number of sheriffs making such payments rose to twenty four, twenty three and twenty one. This perhaps goes some way to explaining why the post Michaelmas 1258 revenue figures for the county farms/ increments are higher despite the fall in incremental values for these years, i.e. more sheriffs were being forced either to pay money towards clearing their outstanding debts or were having past payments audited. The clear example of the former comes in the case of Peter, son of Herbert. He had a large sum of money

¹¹⁰*CChR*, 1257-1300, p. 20; *CPR*, 1258-66, pp. 34-5, 52-3; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, p. 182. The details of this grant will be commented upon more fully in the next chapter.

outstanding for the remainder of the Yorkshire county farm. No payments by him have been traced as regards clearing this debt for the years Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258, but in Michaelmas 1258-9 he paid £225¹¹¹ towards the debt, followed by £25 in the subsequent year¹¹², 40m in the year after that¹¹³ and 20m in Michaelmas 1261-62¹¹⁴. The implication here is quite clearly that the years of reform saw a greater effort in the collection of past dues for the county farms and profits/increments than had been the case in the mid 1250s.

Unfortunately, finding both an explanation and further evidence for this increase in shire revenue after 1258 is difficult. The figures in the previous table refer to cash payments enrolled on the pipe rolls, and since the pipe rolls were an audit of the shire accounts, these figures do not necessarily reflect the actual payments into the exchequer of receipt in any given year. It was possible that a sheriff could have paid money into the lower exchequer but not have had it audited on the pipe rolls till years later, thus distorting the figures contained in this table. Therefore other evidence has to be examined in order to back up the picture created by the pipe rolls as laid out in the previous two paragraphs.

The *Adventus Vicecomitum*, as contained on the memoranda rolls, is one such area of evidence. Before a sheriff had his county account audited at the upper exchequer, he was

¹¹¹E. 372/103, m. 1d.

¹¹²E. 372/104, m. 6.

¹¹³E. 372/105, m. 19d.

¹¹⁴E. 372/106, m. 38.

expected to make two proffers of money towards the payment of his account. The amounts of these two proffers, made at Easter and Michaelmas, were recorded on the *Adventus Vicecomitum* in the memoranda rolls and also on the receipt rolls as cash payments into the lower exchequer. Taking, as an example, the financial year Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259, the first proffer for a sheriff for that year would be at Easter 1259, and would be contained on the Michaelmas 1258 to Trinity 1259 memoranda roll, with the second proffer at Michaelmas 1259, as contained on the Michaelmas 1259 to Trinity 1260 memoranda roll. The *Adventus* thus gives a better idea of the cash flow into the exchequer from the sheriffs than the pipe rolls do. However, the cash paid in as part of the *Adventus* by the sheriffs came from all manner of sources, and was not just restricted to income raised from the shire issues. Therefore changes in income from the *Adventus* do not necessarily reflect the changes in revenues raised from the shire issues. The table below shows the annual values of the *Adventus* for the period¹¹⁵:-

Financial Year	Sum paid in at both <i>Adventi</i>
Mich. 1255-56	£2410
Mich. 1256-57	£3184 16s 8d
Mich. 1257-58	£2040 13s 4d
Mich. 1258-59	£2495 13s 8. 5d

¹¹⁵These figures differ slightly from those contained in E. F. Jacob, *Studies*, p. 249. This is due to differences between the Lord Treasurer's (E. 368) and the King's (E. 159) memoranda rolls.

Mich. 1259-60	£1993	6s	8d
Mich. 1260-61	£2443	9s	1d

The drop in the Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1260 proffer figure compared to the years either side of it was probably caused by thirteen of the sheriffs for this year making a third form of proffer totalling £439 8s 2. 5d. This is contained on the Michaelmas 1259 receipt roll, which records these thirteen sheriffs making payments into the lower exchequer in late February and March 1260 before the Easter proffer¹¹⁶. Bearing in mind this third proffer of Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1260, which would give an approximate total of £2380 for that year, and considering the high Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1257 figure as being 'extraordinary', caused probably by larger proffer demands from the exchequer to help finance dealing with the problems that had erupted in Wales, then the period of reform does show slightly higher levels of proffers. However, the difference is such as to be minimal.

The evidence concerning the administration of the shire farms and increments therefore points to conflicting conclusions. It is clear that the liable increments and variable profits above the basic county farm were lower for the years of reform, whilst that the pipe rolls suggest that the amount of cash collected from this source of revenue actually went up. From this, it can certainly be claimed that the introduction of variable profits was a financial failure for the exchequer that was only remedied by a return to fixed increments. However, the latter evidence

¹¹⁶E. 401/41, m. 13, 14.

concerning the increase in cash receipts is harder to put into perspective. Whether what is contained on the pipe rolls reflects a genuine rise in cash receipts or just a result of the vagaries of pipe roll accounting is debatable. If a conclusion is to be drawn from this pipe roll increase, it is that the exchequer was possibly making a greater effort in auditing the sheriffs accounts by attempting to clear outstanding shrieval accounts. This point will be more fully developed in the next chapter in the analysis of the reformers' period in power.

As part of the system of rendering for variable profits, the reformers in 1258 had proposed a system of salary allowances that were to be paid out to the custodial sheriffs as a means of compensating them for their work. This concept of the payment of allowances to sheriffs for custodial tenure of the counties stemmed back to the beginning of the century and coincided with those periods where variable profits above the farm were introduced. Some of the custodial sheriffs introduced by King John had received a fixed salary to help cover their expenses, but this was by the king's generosity and not of 'right', though most served the king at their own expense¹¹⁷. The years 1224 to 1229 saw the reappearance of allowances when most of the shires were placed under custodial sheriffs. However, in many shires, the size of the allowance granted effectively wiped out any financial gain to the

¹¹⁷Stacey, *Politics*, p. 49; Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff', p. 10.

exchequer created by variable profit accounting¹¹⁸. The last occasion prior to 1258 when allowances were paid out was during the period 1236 to 1240 when again variable profits and custodial tenure were reintroduced. The payment of salary allowances during this latter period was not standard. Sheriffs not rendering for variable profits above their county farms - those for Kent, Lincoln, Worcester and London/ Middlesex - received no such allowance whilst the other sheriffs received no standard sum for their term of office. The value of these allowances depended on the arrangement made between the sheriff and the exchequer concerning the nature of the tenure. The sheriffs responsible just for the custody of their county were paid salaries in the region of £20 to 40m a year, whilst those sheriffs keeping both the county and castles within the shire were paid higher sums to compensate them for their increased costs, ranging from £60 a year in the case of the Norfolk/ Suffolk sheriff to £200 a year for the respective sheriffs of Northumberland and of Shropshire/ Staffordshire¹¹⁹.

The first reforming dictate concerning the payment of allowances to the Michaelmas 1258 sheriffs was contained in the Provisions of Oxford which stated that the king was to *'pay him(the sheriff) out of his own revenues, according to his proffer, sufficiently to enable him to administer the county justly'*¹²⁰. This was followed up in the Ordinance of Sheriffs with the announcement that *'when the sheriff comes at the end of his year,*

¹¹⁸Stacey, *Politics*, p. 51; Carpenter, 'The Decline of the Curial Sheriff', pp. 10-13.

¹¹⁹E. 372/81-84.

¹²⁰DBM, p. 109.

*he will be allowed on his account the reasonable expenses which he will have incurred in keeping his bailiwick. . . . and for this we give him of our own revenues, since we wish that he shall have no reason to take anything from someone else*¹²¹. The salary allowance for shrieval office holders was thus a means of remuneration to replace the previous means by which a sheriff could receive income from his office, i.e. by keeping any money raised above the county farm and fixed increment.

However, despite these intentions being stated in 1258 concerning the payment of allowances, the actual realisation of this policy was very limited in its effects. The pipe rolls for the two financial years Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1260, which contain all the accounts for the counties for the Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 year, do not contain any references indicating that the custodial sheriffs for that year received any salaries, i.e. there are no allowances conceded to the sheriffs in the part of the county account sections devoted to deductions allowed to the sheriff against the county farm and variable profit that he was liable for. This contrasts with the case for the years 1236 to 1240 when allowances were conceded, in most cases, to the county sheriff straight away when their accounts were audited at the exchequer, through means of a deduction of the relevant allowance from the shire issues for which they were liable¹²².

¹²¹DBM, p. 123.

¹²²E. 372/81-84. I have not found any allowances paid out for the Lancashire sheriff for this period in these four pipe rolls. In those counties where an allowance was not immediately granted, it was invariably conceded within three years of the initial audit.

The other place that one might expect to find any mention of allowances is in the county accounts section of the Michaelmas 1259 to Trinity 1260 memoranda roll¹²³. It was during this period that the shire accounts on the Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 pipe roll were audited. Hence, the above mentioned memoranda roll gives information about this audit through recording the sheriffs accounting for each county, what date their account was heard at the exchequer, what outstanding debts were due from people within the county, and, at the end of each shire account, a statement of where the sheriff stood as regards the clearing of his account, i.e. how much he still owed and when he was expected to pay it off. It is in this latter section that there is evidence suggesting an intention on the part of the exchequer to grant allowances to certain sheriffs.

Nine counties have entries which mention expenses either claimed or connected with a sheriff's tenure in office. These claims for expenses presumably refer to a demand by these sheriffs for a salary allowance to be deducted from any outstanding sums they owed at the exchequer. It is only in one case, that of Simon de Hedon, the sheriff of Nottingham/ Derby, that the entry clearly states that an allowance for the custody of the county is being granted - a figure of 50m being mentioned¹²⁴.

¹²³Since Lancashire, Wiltshire and Buckingham/Bedford did not have their Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 accounts audited until the Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1260 pipe roll was drawn up, their relevant memoranda roll entries are found in the Michaelmas 1260 to Trinity 1261 roll.

¹²⁴E. 368/35, m. 22.

This sum was deducted from the money that Simon owed in order to clear his account, which was £73 17s 5d, and a new sum of £40 10s 9d was given to him as his outstanding debt. None of the other eight examples specifically mention allowances for the custody of the county, the reference always being to expenses, of which five counties have a figure mentioned for the possible value of these 'expenses'. Anketil de Martivaus, the Warwick/Leicestershire sheriff, was conceded £33 1m for his expenses which were deducted from his dues¹²⁵. The Devon sheriff, William de Curtenay, asked for his debt of £27 4s 10d to be allowed to him for expenses¹²⁶. Similarly, David de Jarpenvill, the Surrey/Sussex sheriff, claimed his outstanding debt of £28 15s 4d to be allowed to him as expenses and for the custody of Guildford castle and the carriage of prisoners¹²⁷. At the end of the Oxfordshire/Berkshire account, £39 2s 3d is recorded as still needing to be paid; of this, £9 10s 4. 5d is recorded as going to make up the county corpus with the rest being claimed by the sheriff Peter Foliot as his expenses¹²⁸. Similarly, at the end of the Wiltshire account the sheriff, Geoffrey de Scudemore, was saddled with a debt of £33 19s 3d *'concerning which he claims his expenses and the assent of the marshal'*¹²⁹. The three remaining counties of these nine do not give a figure for the expenses claimed. The Lincoln and Northumberland sheriffs, William de Engelby and

¹²⁵E. 368/35, m. 22d.

¹²⁶E. 368/35, m. 29.

¹²⁷E. 368/35, m. 30.

¹²⁸E. 368/35, m. 23.

¹²⁹E. 159/34, m. 22d.

John de Plessetis respectively, asked for expenses without any sums being mentioned¹³⁰, whilst the Cambridge/ Huntingdon account for William le Moyne states that his receipts fall short by £23 16s 11d of making up the county corpus '*beyond the expenses which he had in the custody of the county*'¹³¹. As can be seen from the above, seven of the sheriffs were either claiming or asking for 'expenses', though it is only in the two cases of Nottingham/ Derbyshire and of Warwick/ Leicestershire that a definite sum was mentioned as being allowed to the sheriffs. However, even in these two cases, as will be shown later, the 50m sums assigned to Simon de Hedon and Anketil de Martivaus on the Michaelmas 1259 to Trinity 1260 memoranda roll were not the allowances eventually given to them. The conclusions that can be derived from these memoranda roll entries must be that certain sheriffs wished to receive allowances for their tenure as custodial sheriffs and hence made demands for them, but that the exchequer had not as yet decided on a general policy as regards dealing with such claims.

Further evidence confirming this uncertainty at the exchequer as regards dealing with allowances occurs in the *Close Rolls* for 1261. The Barons of the Exchequer, following a claim for expenses from the executors of the estate of Peter Foliot, were asked to inquire into how much the other sheriffs ought to be allowed for expenses¹³². Although this shows that the exchequer was aware of having to deal with the issue of granting allowances,

¹³⁰E. 368/35, m. 26, 31.

¹³¹E. 368/35, m. 20.

¹³²*Close Rolls*, 1259-61, p. 478.

it is the wording of the entry that is perhaps significant. This message to the exchequer barons ends with the words '*si viderint expedire*' (if they see it to be expedient), and implies a lack of urgency and importance attached to this business. The fact that this command was issued a year after the allowance scheme was dropped also seems to back up this lack of importance attached to allowances, especially since for the majority of sheriffs there are no chancery or exchequer entries connected with them receiving allowances for their period in office 1258-9. This lack of importance is further demonstrated by the time gap between the rendering of accounts for the year 1258-9 and the actual receiving of the allowances by certain sheriffs as audited on the pipe rolls. Only two of these custodial sheriffs received their allowance before the Royalist victory at Evesham, with the rest of these sheriffs who received an allowance getting their sums after Henry's resumption of power in the years after 1265.

The only clear evidence for allowances having been granted by the exchequer comes from the pipe roll audits after Michaelmas 1260, and even then the granting of allowances was by no means comprehensive for all the sheriffs. I have only been able to trace ten cases which clearly show an allowance being given to a sheriff and which were enrolled on the pipe rolls. Of these allowances, only two, as stated above, were conceded before the victory of the Royalist side at Evesham. The first of these cases concerned Peter Foliot, the sheriff of Oxford and Berkshire for the last three quarters of the Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 financial year. Following Peter's death, the Barons of the Exchequer were ordered in 1261, as noted previously, to inquire how much allowance ought to be made to the executors of Peter's

will concerning his expenses as sheriff¹³³. This was followed by the grant of an *allocate* writ to his wife and the executors of his will for the sum of £20 for his expenses in the county as the king's 'improver'¹³⁴. This allowance to Peter's estate was then enrolled on the pipe roll for the financial year Michaelmas 1260 to Michaelmas 1261 as a deduction against the outstanding sums due to the exchequer from Peter's term of office as sheriff¹³⁵. The second case of an allowance being granted before Evesham was that of Simon de Hedon, the Nottingham and Derby sheriff, who received a 40m allowance on the Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 pipe roll¹³⁶.

Seven other sheriffs, Anketil de Martivaus¹³⁷, Eustace de Watford¹³⁸, John de Plessetis¹³⁹, Fulk Peyforer¹⁴⁰, William le

¹³³*Close Rolls*, 1259-61, p. 478.

¹³⁴*CLR*, 1260-67, p. 41.

¹³⁵E. 372/105, m. 24.

¹³⁶E. 372/106, m. 2.

¹³⁷E. 372/117, m. 5d. The Warwick/Leicester sheriff for the term Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259.

¹³⁸E372/110, m. 5. The Northamptonshire sheriff for the above period.

¹³⁹E. 372/113, m. 39. The Northumberland sheriff for the same period.

¹⁴⁰E. 372/110, m. 9. Fulk received £40 for his custody of Kent for the above period and £10 for his custody of Milton manor.

¹⁴¹E.372/111, m. 9. William was the custodial sheriff for Cambridge/Huntingdon.

¹⁴²*CLR*, 1267-72, p. 168. '*Allocate to Simon de Pateshull, formerly sheriff and improver of Buckingham and Bedford, the customary allowance.*' The

Moyne¹⁴¹, Simon de Patteshull¹⁴², and Godfrey de Scudemore¹⁴³ were all allocated sums on the pipe rolls for their term of office either after the royalist victory in 1265 or, in the case of Anketil, in Edward I's reign. The tenth case of a sheriff receiving an allowance is that of William de Engelby, the Lincolnshire sheriff. The second pipe roll of Edward I's reign records Thomas de Moulton as accounting for William's outstanding debts at the exchequer and being granted an allowance for William's term as sheriff in Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259¹⁴⁴. In all these eight cases, with the exception of Godfrey de Scudemore, who received a £15 allowance, and Fulk Peyforer, who received a £40 allowance, the value of the allowance granted was 40m.

In addition to the above clear examples of an allowance being paid, there is one case which is not so clear cut. Robert de Meysy, the Gloucester sheriff, was given an *allocate* writ stating that he was to be given '*the customary allowance*' for his keeping of Gloucester¹⁴⁵. However, there is no mention of a sum

allowance given to him was enrolled on pipe roll 54 Henry III (E. 372/114, m. 1).

¹⁴³*Close Rolls*, 1264-68, p. 187; E. 368/41, m. 4d; *CLR*, 1260-67, p. 257. In January 1267 Godfrey was given an *allocate* writ for £15 for keeping the county of Wiltshire for three parts of the 43rd year and for the first quarter of the 44th year of Henry's reign (Christmas 1258 to Christmas 1259). However, this allowance had been previously recorded on the pipe roll for Michaelmas 1265-66 (E. 372/110, m. 10).

¹⁴⁴E. 372/118, m. 7.

¹⁴⁵*CLR*, 1267-72, p. 79.

or any corresponding entry on the pipe rolls giving him such an allowance.

It is not clear why certain sheriffs received allowances and others did not. The amount of variable profit raised above the farm was not a determinant since the Norfolk/ Suffolk sheriff, Hamo Hauteyn, did not receive an allowance despite raising £88 11s 3d above the farm, whilst William de Engelby's estate was granted an allowance although William had fallen considerably short in trying to raise the basic county farm for Lincolnshire. In addition, the value of those allowances granted did not reflect differences in the level of variable profit raised with John de Plessitis being given a higher allowance of 40m, as compared to Peter Foliot, despite having raised a lower profit from his county. The connection between those sheriffs mentioned on the 1259-60 memoranda roll as claiming expenses and those sheriffs who actually received them is not totally clear cut either. Although seven of these sheriffs mentioned on the memoranda roll did subsequently receive allowances, as recorded on the pipe rolls, the sums granted had little to do with any figures mentioned on this roll. The Wiltshire, Cambridge/ Huntingdon, Oxford/ Berkshire, Lincoln and Northumberland sheriffs were all conceded allowances which seem to have no connection with any sums mentioned on this roll. While Simon de Hedon and Anketil de Martivaus, the Nottingham/ Derby and Warwick/ Leicester sheriffs who had both been given 50m deductions against their debts on this memoranda roll, in fact only received 40m allowances. The other two sheriffs with entries mentioning expenses on this same roll, i.e. the Devon and Surrey/ Sussex

sheriffs, have no further references to allowances or expenses after the date of this roll.

It is thus difficult to avoid the conclusion that the implementation of the reforms concerned with giving custodial sheriffs salary allowances for their tenure in office was administered badly. There was little correlation or consistency about the granting of such allowances, as shown by the evidence provided above, which implies a lacklustre approach to this aspect of financial reform. Allowances were not granted at once or comprehensively, instead being conceded to individual sheriffs at different times after Michaelmas 1259. The impression thus given is that if the exchequer had a policy concerning the granting of allowances, it was that the individual sheriffs were left to apply for them individually.

Given that the reforms started in 1258 were as much about reforming local government to satisfy the knightly class as about political change in central government¹⁴⁶, it is probable that the custodial system was introduced in Michaelmas 1258 as a response to pressure from the localities¹⁴⁷. Although the change in

¹⁴⁶R. F. Treharne, 'Knights in the period of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67: A Critical Phase in the Rise of a New Class', *BIHR*, xxi (1946-48), p. 10.

¹⁴⁷This seems to hold true whether one takes the Treharne view (as outlined in the above article) of the political power of the knightly class being reflected in the number of reforms geared towards satisfying their interests, or whether one follows the view expressed by P. R. Coss that the reformers appealed to the knightly class by resolving their complaints as a means of support for the reform process. P. R. Coss, 'Sir Geoffrey de

accounting procedure concerning the shire farms might have resulted from demands by the knightly class, it is, however, difficult to assess the effect or influence of financial policy on political events. Did the dropping of the custodial scheme of looking after the counties in Michaelmas 1259 have the tacit support of the localities or was it just thrust upon them by a central administration which considered this reform to be unworkable, given that it had led to a decrease in the amount of county revenues for which the sheriffs were liable? It must be borne in mind here that the 1259-60 increments imposed were higher than the 1258-9 profits. Thus, by dropping the custodial scheme the localities were faced with higher financial demands for Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1260 than for the previous year. Did they accept this reversal because they accepted a practical problem and because the 1259-60 increments imposed were a lot lower than the 1257-8 set? The possibility of a compromise is suggested here.

The point to consider, as regards the above, is that the local knights opposed Henry III in 1261, when he annulled the Provisions of Oxford and the associated reforms and inserted, or tried to, his own sheriffs into the counties, yet they did not make a major grievance about the dropping of the custodial scheme at the end of 1259. There is an implication here that the financial aspects of the reforms were perhaps not the most important part to the localities, i.e. they resisted Henry III in 1261 because of the political implications of his seizure of power and the effect this

would have in the localities, i.e. less local control of the shrieval office. This lessening of the importance of the financial aspect is perhaps also shown through the fact that the localities opposed the new 1261 sheriffs despite the fact that some of those inserted in 1261 were given lower increment figures¹⁴⁸. However, the above proposition is somewhat weakened when one considers that the variable profit accounting scheme was again reintroduced in the mid 1260s once the reforming magnates under Simon de Montfort had regained power in 1263. For Simon de Montfort to reintroduce this scheme implies that there must ^{have} ~~of~~ been a sizeable degree of political popularity attached to it. Else why otherwise introduce something that had not been financially successful.

The period of the reforming magnates control of the central administration, in respect to the county farms, therefore appears to have had contrasting results. A policy of custodial sheriffs accounting for variable profit was introduced and then dropped, having been unsuccessful. However, this failure is tempered by the apparent financial success in collecting more cash from the shire farms and increments and evidence of a slightly more vigorous approach to the auditing of shire issues. There is evidence to suggest that local sheriffs chosen by the counties were being elected to the shrieval office, yet the yearly tenure of sheriffs, which was implemented initially, was dropped after Michaelmas 1260. Salary allowances were given out to certain sheriffs for acting as custodians for the shires, but nearly

¹⁴⁸This point will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter on Henry's regaining of power 1261-63.

all these were granted out after Evesham after the defeat of the reforming party. Thus, whilst the reformers made efforts to change the administration of the shires, the reforms introduced cannot be claimed to have been successful.

Chapter 4

Reform and Finance, 1258-1261

On assuming power in 1258, the reforming magnates were faced with dealing with the disorder that the royal finances were in. The king's Sicilian ambitions had come to nothing and the barons had to extract the country from the associated obligations of this affair whilst facing up to the fact that royal revenues had, by 1258, declined since the 1240s. In addition, there was a perception that the king's financial administration had been prone to inefficiency, with royal resources having been squandered through Henry's mismanagement of patronage. The reformers intended to put right these grievances and, to that extent, the reform programme, as contained in the Provisions of Oxford and Westminster and the Ordinance of Sheriffs, put forward proposals aimed at improving the king's finances. In this chapter, those financial reforms not covered in the previous chapter will be commented upon alongside an analysis in the revenue trends in the period Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261.

The dominant financial demand of the king in the years leading up to the Spring of 1258 had been the papacy's requirements for money in return for Henry receiving the Sicilian throne for his son Edmund. However, whilst the financial

problems associated with this undertaking were not the immediate cause of the magnates revolt against the king¹, they had contributed to the king's weak financial and political situation at the time of the revolution. Henry had previously asked the pope in 1257 for a mitigation of the terms concerning Sicily. The papal envoy Arlot, in mid March 1258, had given the pope's reply. This entailed Henry confirming the promise of his envoys in Rome to pay 10,000m at once, and Henry promising to pay a further 30,000m in addition (with all papal grants to the king being used for this purpose). Henry was also to undertake to come to Sicily by March 1259, and that for the required force Henry had to ask his lay magnates for an aid². Henry was thus faced with a severe financial crisis at this stage. A Council meeting in early 1258 resulted in the clergy refusing assent to the above plans and withdrawing from the Council. Negotiations with the barons combined with their armed demonstration against the Lusignans at the April Westminster parliament then forced Henry into agreeing to reform of the realm. After this climb down on Henry's part, control over the Sicilian affair passed to the reforming magnates.

A solution to the papacy's demands over Sicily was needed by the reformers if they were to effect a successful overhaul of the king's financial position. Although the finance for

¹D. A. Carpenter, 'What happened in 1258?', *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J. O. Prestwich*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 106-119.

²R. F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform 1258-1263* (Manchester 1971), pp. 64-5.

the 135,000m demanded by the pope for the Sicilian throne had been intended to come from ecclesiastical taxation, Henry had been forced to mortgage other financial resources to raise loans from merchants to help cover the papacy's demands and other associated costs. In return for reform, the magnates had promised, concerning the Sicilian matter, that *'they would loyally use their influence with the community of the realm so that a common aid should be granted to us (the king) for that purpose'* provided the pope would change the conditions pertaining to this affair³. The Provisions of Oxford then allowed for the appointment of 24 men to negotiate for an aid for the king⁴. This arrangement made it certain that no aid would be granted as the magnates gave no guarantee that they could obtain an aid from the community of the realm. In any case, with the Sicilian affair being regarded in England as a folly, the magnates were always likely to deem possible papal concessions as insufficient⁵. Following an embassy sent by the reformers to Rome to discuss both Sicilian matters and reform of the realm, the pope, realising that Henry had no chance of fulfilling his promise over Sicily, refused the magnates' offer of negotiation over an aid and declared that his offer of the Sicilian crown to Henry was void⁶. Thus the shadow cast by the Sicilian affair over the financial state of the realm was removed. However, this came at the loss of any support from the papacy for the

³DBM, p. 73.

⁴DBM, p. 105.

⁵Carpenter, 'What happened in 1258?', p. 109.

⁶Carpenter, 'What happened in 1258?', p. 109; Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 107.

magnates' reforming aims as was subsequently demonstrated by the pope's repudiation of the reform process in 1261 when he absolved Henry from the oath he swore at Oxford in 1258 to uphold the reforms⁷.

The reforms introduced by the barons pertaining to the royal finances had as their aim the introduction of a fairer administrative system less prone to corruption, the addressing of grievances of both magnates and local society, a reduction in wasteful patronage grants, and the creation of a means by which the magnates could keep a check upon the king's financial behaviour. The reforms connected with these aims were primarily contained in three ordinances: the Provisions of Oxford, the Ordinance of Sheriffs and the Provisions of Westminster. However, there are problems in determining how effectively these reforms were implemented. These problems centre around the length of time the reformers had in effective control over the government administration. There were approximately three years between the reformers assumption of power in the Summer of 1258 to the king's regaining of power in 1261 when he overthrew the reform process. With the last of the reform proposals being enacted in October 1259 with the Provisions of Westminster, there were less than two years in which the full reform process was theoretically in operation. Given that this period is relatively short, an analysis of how effective and successful the reforms were is limited, though it is easier to determine whether reforming proposals were enacted since chancery and exchequer records would point to changes in the running of the financial administration.

⁷*DBM*, pp. 239-41.

Three tables are listed below concerning revenue during the period Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261. The first two are the adjusted and actual revenue tables based on the pipe rolls, whilst the third table lists receipt roll income in 1259. A lack of surviving receipt rolls means that receipt roll tables for 1260 and 1261 cannot be drawn up⁸.

Adjusted Revenue

	Mich. 1258-59	Mich. 1259-60	Mich. 1260-61
<u>Shire Accounts</u>			
Shire Issues	£1538	£1687	£1740
Demesne	£4897	£4150	£4091
Judicial	£2649	£2044	£2395
Debts	£1537	£1946	£1089
Jews	£97	£57	£63
Feudal	£422	£586	£423
Taxation	£336	£609	£1544
Forest	£261	£116	£71
Miscellaneous	£349	£91	£21
TOTAL	£12,086	£11,286	£11,437
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>			
Eccl. Vacancies	£1763	£1731	£2402
Demesne	£123	£115	£72
Forest	£5	£6	£5

⁸The Michaelmas receipt rolls for both 1260 and 1261 are missing, and therefore yearly totals for receipts into the lower exchequer cannot be determined for 1260 and 1261.

Mint/Exchange	£290	£365	£185
Miscellaneous	£1	-	£50
Escheats/Seisins	£24	£50	£24
TOTAL	£2206	£2267	£2738
TOTAL(Shire and Foreign Accounts)	£14,292	£13,553	£14,175
MISC. CASH	£1929	£363	£229
WARDROBE CASH	£637	£11, 688	£2667
TOTAL CASH	£16,858	£25,604	£17,071
CREDITS	£11,880	£10,317	£7072
TOTAL NOTIONAL INCOME	£28,738	£35,921	£24,143

Actual Revenue

	Mich. 1258-59	Mich. 1259-60	Mich. 1260-61
<u>Shire Accounts</u>			
Shire Issues	£1378	£1817	£1670
Demesne	£5973	£3535	£4264
Judicial	£2947	£1819	£2388
Debts	£1909	£2026	£917
Jews	£104	£59	£63
Feudal	£248	£673	£444
Taxation	£364	£329	£1688
Forest	£246	£132	£75
Miscellaneous	£350	£90	£24
TOTAL	£13,519	£10,480	£11,533
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>			
Eccl. Vacancies	-	£3993	£159
Demesne	-	£235	£189

Forest	-	£54	£247
Mint/Exchange	-	£822	£3
Miscellaneous	-	£1	£50
Escheats/Seisins	-	£68	£23
TOTAL	-	£5173	£671
TOTAL(Shire and Foreign Accounts)	£13,519	£15,653	£12,204
MISC. CASH	£1929	£363	£229
WARDROBE CASH	£637	£11,688	£2667
TOTAL CASH	£16,085	£27,704	£15,100
CREDITS	£9319	£15,550	£5303
TOTAL NOTIONAL INCOME	£25,404	£43,254	£20,403

Easter and Michaelmas 1259 Receipt Roll Income⁹

Sheriffs	£3866
Demesne	£4858
Judicial	£1582
Debts	£1045
Jews	£1061
Feudal	£915
Taxation	£250
Forest	£96
Foreign Accounts	£1713
Miscellaneous	£1509
TOTAL	£16,895

⁹E. 401/40, 41.

The figures from the adjusted revenue table suggest that the period Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261 saw an increase in income for the crown. The average annual cash revenue, as paid into the exchequer and wardrobe, in the mid 1250s of £17,000 having gone up to just under £19,850 for the 1258-61 period. Likewise, total notional income went up with an annual average of £29,600 for 1258-61 comparing with one of £27,500 for the 1255-58 period. The reasons for this rise lie with the high figures from the Michaelmas 1259-60 financial year, the figures for the two years either side, i.e. 1258-59 and 1260-61 are approximately at the same level as the equivalent figures from the period 1255-58. This high 1259-60 figure stems from the abnormally high figure for receipts into the wardrobe which were not accounted for on the pipe roll foreign and shire accounts. The sources of these large receipts will be commented upon later in the chapter.

There is a difficulty in coming to conclusions about changes in cash revenue figures. This centres around the discrepancy between the income recorded on the pipe rolls for the shire and foreign accounts and that recorded on the receipt rolls. The receipt roll totals for 1259 (the one year in which yearly receipts into the lower exchequer can be worked out for the 1258-61 period) show a rise over the equivalent figures for 1257 and 1258, as recorded in a previous chapter. For Easter and Michaelmas 1259, the receipt rolls recorded exchequer income as being £16,895¹⁰, whilst the equivalent totals for 1257 and 1258 were £14,129 and £13,525. This suggests that the receipt rolls

¹⁰E. 401/40, 41.

back up the point mentioned in the previous paragraph that cash income rose in the period of reform as compared to the 1255-58 period. However, the totals for average yearly income audited on the pipe rolls for the shire and foreign account receipts fall for the Michaelmas 1258 to 1261 period as compared to the years Michaelmas 1255 to 1258, the corresponding figures being £14,000 for 1258-61 and £15,500 for 1255-58.

In explaining this discrepancy, the obvious assumption is that not all income being paid into the exchequer was being audited on the pipe roll accounts. This does appear to be the case, as is suggested by the figures for miscellaneous cash receipts in the adjusted revenue table. In theory, the receipts on the Easter and Michaelmas 1259 receipt rolls should approximately equal the receipts audited on the 1258-59 pipe roll as being paid into the exchequer, this latter figure being £12,965¹¹. However, receipts of £1929 were recorded as being paid into the lower exchequer in 1259 which went unrecorded on the 1258-59 pipe roll. This £1929 consisted of £933 6s 8d, which was delivered to the exchequer in the Easter 1259 term out of the monies of the banished Elect of Winchester¹², and of £996 received from the Jews¹³. Even taking away this £1929, the remaining 1259 receipt roll income of £14,966 is still some £2000 higher than the pipe roll exchequer income figures for the same period. There is thus a

¹¹This has been reached by deducting receipts audited as having been paid into the wardrobe (£1327) from the £14,292 total for shire and foreign account receipts in the 1258-59 adjusted revenue table.

¹²E. 401/40, m. 5, 6.

¹³E. 401/40, m. 10; E. 401/41, m. 11.

difference between the 1258-59 pipe roll and the 1259 receipt rolls as regards how much income the exchequer received in 1259.

This discrepancy could lie in the different functions and chronology of the two sets of rolls. As stated in chapter 1, the pipe rolls were an audit and do not necessarily reflect the actual amount of cash paid into the exchequer during any precise financial year, and thus an exact match is not possible between pipe rolls and receipt rolls. If the pipe roll of 1258-59 misses income received into the lower exchequer of that year, it should be reflected in higher exchequer income figures on the pipe rolls after 1261 as compared to receipt roll income figures. Unfortunately it is impossible to check this since after Easter 1260 there are no complete receipt rolls for each financial year for the rest of Henry's reign, whilst the increasing infrequency of regular shrieval attendance at the exchequer after Michaelmas 1261 throws doubt on how far the pipe roll income figures for these years actually reflect cash payments into the exchequer¹⁴.

That an approximate match up between the receipt rolls and pipe rolls cannot be achieved as regards exchequer income might also suggest lax auditing procedures at the exchequer during the years of reform. Certainly some irregularities are suggested through missing accounts from officials that were not recorded on the pipe rolls. For example, the account of John Mansel for his tenure as the keeper of the Durham

¹⁴M. H. Mills, '"Adventus Vicecomitum", 1258-72', *EHR*, xxxvi (1921), pp. 488, 492. Highlights the number of sheriffs accounting each year for their shire issues at the exchequer during this period.

bishopric during its vacancy is missing from the pipe roll foreign accounts. John was appointed to this office in August 1260 on the death of Walter, Bishop of Durham¹⁵. The wardrobe account for this period records a £1200 payment into the wardrobe for the Durham bishopric for the 44th and 45th years of Henry III's reign (October 1259 to October 1261)¹⁶, and thus it appears that John, rather than paying the receipts of the bishopric into the exchequer, was paying them directly into the wardrobe. However, since this vacancy occurred during the summer of 1260 when the king was rebuilding his political power, it is possible that John was paying the money direct into the king's wardrobe as a means of enabling the king to build up a store of money outside of the control of the exchequer. A similar example connected with John Mansel concerns the issues of the York archbishopric. The Michaelmas 1258 receipt roll records him as having paid £300 into the exchequer on 14 January 1259¹⁷, yet the pipe rolls again have no account for him keeping the York archbishopric. The major case of money not being audited on the pipe rolls involved the Winchester bishopric, as noted in a previous chapter. According to the Michaelmas 1258 receipt roll, the Hampshire sheriff, James le Sauvage, paid £2933 6s 8d into the exchequer in January 1259 from the issues of the vacant Winchester bishopric¹⁸. Since the account for the vacant Winchester bishopric for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1260 records £2424 7s 6d as

¹⁵*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 90.

¹⁶E. 361/1, m. 1

¹⁷E. 401/39, m. 8

¹⁸E. 401/39, m. 8.

having been paid into the exchequer by thirteen tallies between these dates¹⁹, it is probable that this money paid by James was for the period from the Elect of Winchester's departure from England (following the magnates' revolt against the Lusignans) to the time that Nicholas de Hadlou started his account at Michaelmas 1258 as keeper of the vacant bishopric, i.e. for the Summer of 1258. This explanation seems to be the case as Gerard de la Grue and Walter de la Croce, after having been told to deliver the Winchester bishopric to Nicholas de Hadlou, were commanded to deliver the money collected from the issues of the bishopric to the Hampshire sheriff to be carried to the exchequer at Westminster²⁰. However, given that this was the case then it is not reflected on the pipe rolls with James le Sauvage not accounting for any such sum paid into the exchequer. Two possible explanations point to the reasons for these missing accounts. The first is that the exchequer felt that it was not necessary for all non-shire accounts to be recorded on the pipe rolls, i.e. the exchequer was being lax in its audit procedure. The second possibility is that this failure to ensure the audit of all accounts could reflect an uncertain political situation with those at the centre of the administration being unable to maintain their control over officials in the localities.

Given the problems highlighted in the above few paragraphs about determining royal income in this period, the pipe roll figures for sources of revenue should be treated

¹⁹E. 372/104, mm. 3, 4.

²⁰CPR, 1258-66, p. 7-8.

carefully. However, the problems concerning missing accounts would seem to have the largest effect on categories of revenue that would normally come under the area of the foreign accounts. Because of this latter point, an analysis can be attempted of those revenue categories contained within the shire accounts. The table below shows the changes in revenue categories for cash payments into the exchequer and the wardrobe between the three years prior to Michaelmas 1258 and the three years after that date:-

Average Income			
Source of Revenue	1255-1258	1258-1261	% Decrease/ Increase
Shire Issues	£1147	£1655	+44%
Demesne	£4920	£4380	-11%
Judicial	£4326	£2362	-45%
Debts	£1549	£1523	-1. 5%
Jews	£53	£72	+36%
Feudal	£470	£476	+1%
Taxation	£686	£829	+21%
Forest	£354	£149	-58%
Miscellaneous	£291	£154	-47%

The largest significant change is in the reduction of income from judicial receipts, a loss of about £2000 a year on average. It was this decrease that more than accounts for the overall fall in shire account cash revenue for 1258-61 as compared to 1255-58, with an average £13,800 for the earlier period falling to £11,600 for the years of reform. This fall in judicial receipts was primarily a result of the general eyre only

being in progress for the first half of 1261 during this period, and even then only six counties were visited²¹. The reformers had proposed a special series of eyres for the redress of grievances in November 1259, but this had been postponed and eventually cancelled by the king in June 1260²², though eleven counties had been visited before this cancellation²³. The visitation of 1261 ended up being abandoned since many of the counties that the eyre had intended to visit had received justices on eyre within the past seven years and thus a visitation would have been contrary to the demand in the Provisions of Westminster for counties to have an eyre only once every seven years²⁴. In addition to these two 'part' eyres, Hugh Bigod had crossed the country on his special eyre hearing grievances. However, as this particular eyre was primarily concerned with the hearing of complaints and not making amercements along the lines of the traditional justices on eyre, the cash receipts from Bigod's eyre were very small compared to those of the previous visitations in the mid 1250s.

The fall in demesne revenue over the period of baronial reform, as implied in the above table, is interesting given that, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the 1240s and 1250s had seen the growth of the doctrine of the inalienability of the 'ancient demesne' of the crown. Thus, given this worry about the

²¹D. Crook, *Records of the General Eyre*, PRO Handbooks no. 20 (London, 1982), pp. 128-130.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 126.

²³*Ibid.*, pp. 189-191. Crook states that a visitation to another county, Lincolnshire, was probably begun but not completed.

²⁴*DBM*, p. 151.

state of the royal demesne, it is perhaps surprising that none of the reforming decrees during 1258 and 1259 demanded a resumption of crown lands previously granted out by the king. The only mention during this time of a policy of resumption is in a letter about the Oxford 1258 Parliament where the author states *'and so provision was made to restore to him (the king) all the lands, holdings and castles alienated from the crown by him'*²⁵. Although demands and provisions were clearly made for the transfer of castles into native hands and the administration and granting of wardships and escheats²⁶, there is no further evidence about this plan to resume the royal demesne. Admittedly, at the trial of Simon de Montfort in July 1260, mention is made of an oath sworn by the Council at Windsor not to consent to alienations from the royal demesne; however, this probably refers to the 1257 oath mentioned in a previous chapter²⁷.

One of the explanations for this fall in crown demesne revenue could lie in the restraints placed on royal officials in the localities. The Provisions of Oxford encouraged complaints against local officials whilst other reforms laid down a strict code of behaviour for these officials in the pursuit of their duties. This could well have had the effect of curtailing the amount of revenue raised from demesne issues as seems to have been the case for the shire profits between Michaelmas 1258 and Michaelmas 1259 as officials were reluctant to provoke grievances against themselves. Certainly this would back up Henry's claims in 1261

²⁵*DBM*, p. 93.

²⁶*DBM*, pp. 81, 103, 151, 153.

²⁷*DBM*, p. 197.

that his rights were in the hands of ineffective officials who did not dare to enter lands connected with Council members²⁸.

The decrease in these figures could also reflect greater credit allowances against demesne sources of revenue on the pipe rolls. This possible explanation concerns the fall in revenue for this category for the two years Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1261 as compared to the Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 financial year. In July 1259, Simon de Montfort was granted £400 a year from the farms of crown manors in five counties in settlement of his land grievances with the king²⁹. This replaced the £400 he had received yearly from the shire issues of four counties (which partly explains why the average receipts from the shire issues went up between 1258-61 as compared to 1255-58). The result of this grant was that the exchequer lost £400 worth of potential demesne revenue. Thus, although these grants to de Montfort contributed to the fall in demesne revenue, they were compensated for by the fact that the king was no longer having to pay de Montfort out of the issues of four shires. However, it can be claimed that these grants to de Montfort went against the spirit of the reforming movement in that they suggest that de Montfort was pushing his self interest before any concept of national interest.

One of the grievances that particularly attracted the attention of the reformers was that concerned with wardships and escheats. Charges of abuse of these financial resources were to be

²⁸*DBM*, pp. 213, 221-3.

²⁹*CCHR*, 1257-1300, p. 20; *CPR*, 1258-66, pp. 34-5, 52-3; J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 182.

levied at the king in the reformers' case at Amiens in 1264³⁰. The Provisions of Westminster had appointed the justiciar, the treasurer, Thomas de Wymondham, Roger de Thurkelby and Henry de Bath to deal with escheats and wardships³¹. These appointees were instructed to sell wardships and other feudal rights to reduce the king's debts. The Council, when replying to Henry's grievances against its behaviour in 1261, said of this matter that it had been decided that *'the justiciar and others should sell the wardships and marriages for the king's profit when they fell in, and should set aside part of the proceeds to reduce the king's debts, and use part for the maintenance of his household'*³². The pipe roll accounts suggest that the years of reform were unsuccessful in increasing revenue from these feudal sources since they imply that such feudal revenue fell from £1842 in the three years Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258 to £1529 between Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261. The drop in this revenue resulted from the reduced foreign account figures for the reforming period, the shire account totals between the two years remaining fairly constant. However, these totals are in many respects misleading since other evidence points to the reforming regime arranging large fines for the sale of feudal rights.

In this analysis, large fines for feudal rights will be commented upon. Such fines seem to have been more frequent in the reformers' period of power compared to the 1255-58 period, suggesting either the reformers' desire to extract more revenue

³⁰DBM, p. 277

³¹DBM, p. 153.

³²DBM, p. 221.

from the sale of such resources or the greater availability of wardships and escheats. Smaller fines have been ignored since determining the total value of fines for such smaller sales or grants is hampered in that it is not always possible to trace the value of all these grants.

The first category of feudal fines to be examined is that where the proceeds of the sales were directed towards meeting a specific area of the king's financial commitments. Hawise, the wife of Patrick de Cadurcis, made a 1000m fine for the wardship of the heirs and lands of her late husband in July 1259. This fine was to be paid to the works of the church of Westminster at the rate of 100m for the first year and then £100 in the subsequent years³³. Likewise, Alice, the wife of the late Edmund de Lacy, delivered money that she owed for the wardship of parts of the lands of her husband to the same works³⁴. There are several other examples of feudal fines and rights being assigned to meet specified royal debts. In August 1259, William Bonquer was granted the 300m fine that the wife of Ralph de Normanville made for the wardship of Ralph's lands. This was in compensation for William having previously been granted £30 yearly of land and the wardship of Ralph's lands³⁵. In November 1259 Hugh Bigod was commanded to sell the wardship of the land and heir of John son of Bernard and to assign 100m yearly of the issues of the wardship to Frederick de Fisco³⁶. Later in this month,

³³E. 371/23, m. 7; C. 60/56, m. 4; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 32.

³⁴*CPR*, 1258-66, pp. 82, 157.

³⁵E. 371/23, m. 8; C. 60/56, m. 4; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 37.

³⁶*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 60.

this wardship was granted to Imbert Pugeys on the condition that he paid 100m a year to the said Frederick and answered for the residue of the issues at the exchequer³⁷. This grant implies that the wardship was not actually sold and that instead Imbert acted as a custodian for the issues of the wardship. The marriage of the heirs had been reserved to the king in this grant, and this right was sold in February 1260 to Robert de Cokfeld for a 200m fine³⁸. The widowed wife of Hugh de Vyvona was instructed in April 1260 to pay the £12 yearly she paid for land of her husband's in Wiltshire to Alan Burnel³⁹. A month later a similar grant was made to Richard de Ewell of £16 yearly of rent which John de Pakeham owed the king for the wardship of the lands of the same Hugh in Norton⁴⁰. Such wardship grants and sales, whereby the receipts were directed towards covering specific financial commitments of the crown, seem to have stopped for the year Michaelmas 1260-61.

The above evidence suggests that limited attempts were being made to use the sale of feudal rights to cover dues owed by the king. However, the aspect of the reformers' statement in 1261 about using part of the proceeds of wardship sales to help cover the maintenance of the king's household does not appear to have been particularly successful⁴¹. The wardrobe accounts imply that proceeds used in this way did not amount to

³⁷*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 62.

³⁸*E.* 371/24, m. 2; *C.* 60/57, m. 10; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 65.

³⁹*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 67.

⁴⁰*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 73.

⁴¹*DBM*, p. 221.

much. There are only two fines of any large size that were paid into the wardrobe. John, the son and heir of John fitz Geoffrey made a £300 fine for the custody of the lands of his father in January 1259, of which £200 was paid into the wardrobe⁴². The other payment for such a fine was the £66 1m that Roger de Thurkelby paid for the custody of the lands and heirs of Henry de Merk⁴³.

Alongside the above mentioned wardships, there are several other wardships worth over £100 that were sold but, seemingly, without the fines made being directed towards curtailing specific royal debts. The two largest of such fines were made by Hugh Bigod for £3000 in 1259 for the wardship of the lands and heirs of William de Kyme⁴⁴ and by William de Latimer, who made a 1200m fine for the custody of the lands and heirs of Hugh de Morewyk⁴⁵. Four further examples of wardship fines over £100 have been traced. The wife of Andrew le Blund was given the wardship of his lands and heirs for a 200m fine in August 1259⁴⁶. Stephen Sybry was granted the wardship of the land and heirs of Alan de Rowell for a £100 fine in February 1260⁴⁷. John de Thurbervill made a 400m fine for the wardship of the lands and heirs of John de Venuiz in July 1260⁴⁸. Cresseus and

⁴²E. 371/23, m. 2; C. 60/56, m. 10; E. 361/1, m. 1.

⁴³E. 371/23, m. 7; C. 60/56, m. 5; E. 361/1, m. 1.

⁴⁴E. 371/24, m. 1; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 60.

⁴⁵E. 371/24, m. 1; C. 60/57, m. 11.

⁴⁶C. 60/56, m. 4; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 35.

⁴⁷E. 371/24, m. 2; C. 60/57, m. 9; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 65.

⁴⁸E. 371/24, m. 6; C. 60/57, m. 5; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 82.

Hagin, sons of Mosseus, Jews of London, made a 300m fine for the estate of a fellow Jew, Salamon le Evesk⁴⁹, whilst another Jew, Kok, made a 2000m fine in August 1260 for the estate of his father, Aaron⁵⁰. The impression gained from chancery and exchequer sources is that, in general, the exploitation of wardships, escheats and marriage rights was that more vigorous under the reformers for the period Michaelmas 1258-60, though not all the proceeds of such feudal fines were being directed towards paying off the king's debts or being used for the maintenance of his household.

The sale of such feudal rights seems to have declined from Michaelmas 1260, with the largest sale that has been traced being an 80m fine by Eudo de Shelfhanger for the wardship of the lands and heirs of Robert de Shotebroc⁵¹. Compared to the period Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1260, it is noticeable that from Michaelmas 1260 alot more wardships and escheats were granted out by the king. In addition, and repeating the situation of the mid 1250s, one also finds the payment of fees to individuals until wardships or escheats became available for granting. Such grants had been made under the reformers but to a much reduced extent. This occurrence probably reflected the king giving out patronage as a means of building up support for his attempts to suppress the reforming movement. and would thus partly explain why, after Michaelmas 1260, wardship grants were no longer directed towards covering the king's debts.

⁴⁹E. 371/24, m. 7.

⁵⁰C. 60/57, m. 4.

⁵¹*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 175.

The vast majority of the revenue received by the crown from the Jews during the period Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261 stemmed from annual tallages of 1000m levied each year on the Jewish community as from Easter 1259, these tallages being imposed at the rate of 500m a term⁵². The receipts from these tallages were not noted on the shire or foreign accounts on the pipe rolls, instead being recorded on the receipt rolls and in the wardrobe account. The Easter 1259 receipt roll records payments of just under £650 being received from the Jews. The bulk of this resulted from the 500m promised to the king for his passage to France⁵³. For the following term, Michaelmas 1259, the receipt roll records just over £415 being paid into the lower exchequer, of which £300, paid in on the 18th December, was labelled as being from the tallage levied on the English Jewry⁵⁴. The Easter 1260 term saw receipts of £327 19s 7d from the Jews for their 500m tallage for that term⁵⁵. Whether part of the tallage imposed in the Michaelmas 1260 term was paid into the exchequer cannot be determined since there is no receipt roll for that term. However, the wardrobe accounts note £234 5s 4. 5d as having been paid into the wardrobe as part of the 1000m tallage imposed for the 45th year of Henry's reign (October 1260-October 1261), and this sum could thus have been paid into the

⁵²R. C. Stacey, '1240-60: a Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations', *Historical Research*, lxi (1988), p. 137.

⁵³E. 401/40, m. 10; *CPR*, 1258-61, p. 39.

⁵⁴E. 401/41, m. 11.

⁵⁵E. 401/42, m. 10.

wardrobe during the Michaelmas 1260 term⁵⁶. However, the *Close Rolls* entry noting the imposition of the Michaelmas 1260 tallage makes no reference to the receipts having to be paid into the wardrobe⁵⁷. For the final term of this period, Easter 1261, the receipt rolls record £203 6s 2d as having been paid into the lower exchequer⁵⁸.

It is the payment of the Jewish tallages into the lower exchequer that comprise the bulk of the miscellaneous cash receipts on the revenue tables for Michaelmas 1258-61. These receipts which the crown received from the Jewry during this period contributed to an increase in Jewish revenue as compared to the years 1255-58. This is to be expected since, in the earlier period, the king's brother, not the crown, was the recipient of Jewish proceeds. However, what is notable about the Jewish tallages of 1259-61 is the low level at which they were imposed. On a yearly basis, the annual levy of 1000m for the years of reform was well beneath the average yearly levy imposed between 1240 to 1258⁵⁹. This would suggest that the grievances concerning Jewish debts, as highlighted in the Petition of the Barons and noted previously⁶⁰, meant that the reforming council was treading carefully as regards the imposition of Jewish tallages.

⁵⁶E. 361/1, m. 1.

⁵⁷*Close Rolls, 1259-61*, p. 96-7.

⁵⁸E. 401/44, m. 12.

⁵⁹Stacey, '1240-60: a Watershed', p. 136-7.

⁶⁰*DBM*, p. 87.

R. F. Treharne has stated that the administration of royal finance was improved under the reforming Council as compared to under the king. He claims that there was a far more prompt payment of *liberate* writs between the date of the writ ordering payment and the enrolment noting the issue of payment, whilst there was also an improvement in auditing procedures for crown income⁶¹. This latter point concerned the clearing at the upper exchequer of sums paid to sheriffs and bailiffs by people owing relatively small debts. Treharne reckons that between June 1258 and October 1259, the Exchequer was more active in enquiring into unacquitted debts from preceding years since *'unusually large numbers of ex-sheriffs and bailiffs came up to acquit debtors who had paid their debts but who had not been cleared in the Upper Exchequer'*⁶². He counts 120 such cases for 1257-8 as contained on that memoranda roll, 170 cases for 1258-59, and only 32 for 1259-60, with none of the sheriffs among these cases being nominees of the Council. In fact he reckons that only six such cases affected Council appointed sheriffs between Michaelmas 1258 and Michaelmas 1263⁶³. He suggests that by October 1259, the exchequer *'had succeeded as well as it could hope in clearing up unacquitted debts ranging as far back as 1242, and that the new strictness and insistence upon prompt quittance for payments received reduced the former defects to very insignificant proportions'*⁶⁴.

⁶¹Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, pp. 370-1.

⁶²*Ibid.*, p. 371.

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 371.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, p. 372.

This attitude on the part of the exchequer could well explain why the pipe rolls show an increase for audited cash receipts from shire issues into the lower exchequer and wardrobe for Michaelmas 1258-61 as compared to the three previous years despite there being lower liable increments in force for the later period, i.e. the exchequer was being more insistent on clearing outstanding dues at the upper exchequer. This is best demonstrated in the case of Surrey/ Sussex. On the Michaelmas 1259-60 pipe roll, Gerard de Evington rendered account for £180 for the Surrey/ Sussex increment for his shrieval tenure from Easter 1257 to Michaelmas 1258 whilst Geoffrey de Cruce rendered account for £240 for the county increment for Easter 1255 to Easter 1257⁶⁵. This pipe roll records a total of £223 14s 11d as being paid by these two towards covering their outstanding arrears⁶⁶. There are no entries on the receipt rolls after Michaelmas 1258 recording payments from these two totalling anywhere near this sum. This suggests one of two possibilities. Either these two sheriffs had actually paid the cash noted above into the exchequer prior to Michaelmas 1258 and it was not until the Michaelmas 1259-60 pipe roll was drawn up that the upper exchequer actually audited their previous cash payments, or that the payments from these two were recorded on the missing Michaelmas 1260 receipt roll. This latter possibility is probably the most likely since although the receipt rolls and the *Adventi Vicecomitum* show that the two of them made regular payments into the lower exchequer during their tenures in office

⁶⁵E. 372/104, m. 31d.

⁶⁶E. 372/104, m. 31d.

prior to Michaelmas 1258, the sums involved were very small and do not cover the £223 14s 11d noted on the 1259-60 pipe roll. Either way, this particular case would appear to back up Treharne's suggestion that the exchequer was more active in clearing up debts at the upper exchequer.

Treharne also states that through a purge of undesirable persons from the administration '*the Council secured a civil service willing to work under the new regime*'⁶⁷. Whether this was the case is difficult to tell. Nicholas de Hadlou did not accept the keeping of the vacant Winchester bishopric willingly. His appointment to this office, as noted on the *Patent Rolls*, had the proviso of promising '*to the said Nicholas, who has taken the keeping much against his will to save him and his heirs harmless on account of the taking of the same*'⁶⁸. Yet, against this evidence of reluctance on the part of Nicholas to serve as the keeper of the Winchester bishopric, there are examples of the reformers making efforts to improve administration, such as stopping the king's policy of giving knights in the localities quittances from service in local administration in return for fines. The Provisions of Oxford stated, as part of this policy, that no knights were to be excused on the grounds of any royal charter from serving as one of the four knights making enquiries into grievances against local officials⁶⁹, whilst the Provisions of Westminster stated that such charters of exemption were not to be binding in all cases⁷⁰. These

⁶⁷Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 375

⁶⁸CPR, 1258-66, p. 7.

⁶⁹DBM, p. 99.

⁷⁰DBM, p. 143.

decrees were made to ensure that local administration could function more efficiently, though they do also suggest that perhaps a degree of coercion was needed to force local knights into performing administrative duties in their localities.

However, the Michaelmas and Easter proffers of the sheriffs and representatives of the towns (the *Adventus Vicecomitum*) towards clearing their accounts for each financial year do not suggest a markedly more vigorous approach on the part of the exchequer towards demanding higher proffers during the reforming period. The table below, compiled from the memoranda rolls of the exchequer, outlines the proffers for the financial years Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1261⁷¹:

Year	Term	Sheriffs	Towns	Total
1256	Easter	£1473 6s 8d	£230 13s 4d	£1704
	Mich.	£936 13s 4d	£509 11s 8d	£1446 5s
	Total	£2410	£740 5s	£3150 5s
1257	Easter	£1192 6s 8d	£268 18s 8d	£1461 5s 4d
	Mich.	£1992 10s	£769 10s 4d	£2762 4d
	Total	£3184 16s 8d	£1038 9s	£4223 5s 8d
1258	Easter	£1011	£284 7s	£1295 7s
	Mich.	£1029 1m	£581	£1610 1m
	Total	£2040 1m	£865 7s	£2906 4d

⁷¹E. F. Jacob and M. H. Mills have recorded the yearly proffer totals by the sheriffs at the lower exchequer for these years. However, the figures that they have quoted differ slightly from those noted above. Mills, “*Adventus Vicecomitum*”, p.494; E. F. Jacob, *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67* (Oxford, 1925), pp. 248-9.

1259	Easter	£1249 12s 3d	£388 17s 3d	£1638 9s 6d
	Mich.	£1246 1s 5. 5d	£815 10s 4d	£2061 11s 9. 5d
	Total	£2495 13s 8. 5d	£1204 7s 7d	£3700 1s 3. 5d
1260	Easter	£1075 1m	£441 7s	£1517 4d
	Mich.	£917 1m	£866 8s 8d	£1784 2s
	Total	£1993 6s 8d	£1307 15s 8d	£3301 2s 4d
1261	Easter	£1652 8s 9d	£469 6s 3d	£2121 15s
	Mich.	£791 4d	£807 17s	£1598 17s 4d
	Total	£2443 9s 1d	£1277 3s 3d	£3720 12s 4d

Although the figures for 1259 to 1261 are an increase over the 1256 and 1258 proffer totals, the increase is such as not to be significant. It hardly suggests that the exchequer was demanding higher proffers towards clearing accounts earlier. The only trend as such is that the proffers made by the towns was slightly higher during the period of reform. Therefore, the *Adventi Vicecomitum* does not really point towards a more active exchequer at work after Michaelmas 1258⁷². The only point that these figures do show is that there was no collapse, during the years of reform, in the value of the proffers being made at the exchequer, suggesting that the government under the reformers had not lost any authority over local officials.

In contrast to Treharne's view of the exchequer having been more active in improving the administration of royal finance, there is plenty of evidence to suggest the contrary. Admittedly, as noted in the last chapter, there is evidence to suggest that

⁷²The area of the *Adventus Vicecomitum* has been more fully covered in the previous chapter.

attempts were made to update the audits regarding the income from the shire issues. However, in contrast, in the area of auditing the sheriff's accounts for all the issues of their shires there is little evidence that indicates an improvement in the standard of auditing. As pointed out in the last chapter, the granting of allowances to the 1258-59 sheriffs was disorganised. In addition, the exchequer was not particularly insistent on forcing the custodial sheriffs of the 1258-59 year to close their accounts soon after the end of their tenure in office. Thus, the pipe rolls record sheriffs as owing money for their shrieval tenure for this year well into the late 1260s. For example, it was not until the Michaelmas 1265-66 pipe roll that Eustace de Watford, the Northamptonshire 1258-59 custodial sheriff, was declared quit of the £30 8s 9. 5d he owed for the remainder of the county profit for 1258-59⁷³. Similarly, it was not until the Michaelmas 1269-70 pipe roll that Godfrey de Scudemore, the Wiltshire 1258-59 custodial sheriff, paid off his outstanding shrieval dues⁷⁴. The account of John de Plessetis for his custodial tenure of Northumberland for 1258-59 still remained open at Michaelmas 1269 with debts of £48 13s 2. 5d still pertaining to John. Following the grant of a salary allowance to John for his custody of the county, he still owed £21 19s 10. 5d⁷⁵. Likewise, the memoranda rolls note cases of shrieval accounts from this period of reform having to be cleared up. The Michaelmas 1268 to Trinity 1269 memoranda roll contains an order to John de Reigate,

⁷³E. 372/110, m. 5.

⁷⁴E. 372/114, m. 8.

⁷⁵E. 372/113, m, 39,

the escheator north of the Trent, to take goods and chattels of Simon de Hedon, the 1258-59 Nottingham/ Derby sheriff, to cover Simon's debts from the time he had the custody of that county⁷⁶. The Michaelmas 1267 to Trinity 1268 memoranda roll notes that James le Sauvage, the Hampshire sheriff from Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1259, was allowed to pay off his shrieval arrears at 20m a year⁷⁷. A similar type of command was given to William le Moyne, the 1258-59 custodial sheriff of Cambridge/ Huntingdon, on the Michaelmas 1269 to Trinity 1270 memoranda roll, on which William was allowed to pay off his arrears as sheriff at the rate of 100s a year⁷⁸. These examples quoted above thus demonstrate the failure of the exchequer to get the 1258-59 sheriffs to discharge their debts within a short time after the close of their tenures in office.

As mentioned in the last chapter, one of the complaints that the reformers had levied against the king at Amiens in 1264 was that the arrears of sheriffs and bailiffs, which should have been paid immediately into the exchequer, were attermed for long periods so that, out of large arrears, only 100s or 10m was paid annually towards clearing these debts⁷⁹. However, this practice was pursued during the reformers' period at the helm of the government administration. In July 1259, Hugh de Acovre, a former sheriff of Salop/ Stafford, was allowed to pay off his arrears as sheriff at £10, whilst at the same time Henry,

⁷⁶E. 368/43, m. 7d.

⁷⁷E. 368/42, m. 5.

⁷⁸E. 159/44, m. 3d.

⁷⁹DBM, p. 277.

son of Gervase de Horton, a former Devonshire sheriff, was allowed to pay off the debts of his father at 100s a year and William de Swyneford, the Norfolk/ Suffolk sheriff until Michaelmas 1258, was allowed to pay off his shrieval debts at £20 a year⁸⁰. The following month, August 1259, William de Lisle was granted the payment rate of 20m a term both for his arrears as the sheriff of Northamptonshire and for a 100m fine he had made for transgressions⁸¹. In addition to the above, the Easter and Trinity *communia* from the 1258-59 memoranda roll note two other sheriffs being given relatively low annual payment rates for arrears. William de Lesseberg was allowed to pay off his debts as a former Gloucester sheriff at £40 a year whilst William de Stowe, the Cambridge/ Huntingdon sheriff from Easter 1256 to Michaelmas 1258, was given a repayment rate of £10 a year for his debts⁸². The granting of low annual rates of payment for account arrears continued in the Michaelmas 1259-60 financial year. The fine roll for that year notes seven clear examples of former sheriffs being given payment rates of 30m a year or less for the covering of their account arrears, of which two of the men named, John de Plessetis and James le Sauvage, had been custodial sheriffs for 1258-59⁸³.

Considering the above, it is perhaps surprising that the reformers levied the complaint against Henry III of allowing low

⁸⁰C. 60/56, m. 4, 5; E. 368/34, m. 16d.

⁸¹C. 60/56, m. 4; However, the Michaelmas 1258 to Trinity 1259 memoranda roll states that his repayment rate as being £40 a year (E. 368/34, m. 17).

⁸²E. 368/34, m. 116, 16.

⁸³C. 60/57, m. 5, 6, 9, 11.

annual payment rates for the clearing of arrears since this evidence would suggest that the reformers were not particularly successful in getting local officials to discharge their accounts more quickly. This also implies that reforming the financial administration was a very difficult task to pursue in full, and that the relatively short time the reformers were in power was not sufficient to overhaul and improve the efficiency of revenue raising activities. As noted in the last chapter in the case of Lincolnshire, local society could be very entrenched in its opposition to the revenue raising activities of the sheriffs and there is no reason to suppose that this attitude in the localities was transformed after Michaelmas 1258. Two enquiries launched after the civil war point towards sheriffs in the period of reform having suffered from opposition to their activities. The Michaelmas 1267 to Trinity 1268 memoranda roll records an inquiry being ordered into whether Alexander de Hampden, the Buckingham/ Bedford sheriff from Michaelmas 1259. had been impeded in the pursuit of his shrieval duties⁸⁴. The second such example appears on the Michaelmas 1269 to Trinity 1270 memoranda roll and involves an inquiry into whether Hervey de Stanhou had been impeded in his duties as sheriff, Hervey having been sheriff of Norfolk/ Suffolk from Hilary 1260 to Easter 1261⁸⁵. Therefore, with this evidence of continued intransigence in the localities towards the sheriffs, it is not surprising that the exchequer failed to get sheriffs to discharge their accounts in full within a short time of the end of their tenure in office.

⁸⁴E. 368/42, m. 11.

⁸⁵E.159/44, m. 6.

Despite Treharne's premise that the administration of royal finance was improved under the reforming Council and the evidence he provides of a more active policy of clearing debts at the upper exchequer, it appears on balance that there was no overall improvement in the years of reform, as against the mid 1250s, in the area of financial administration. This was reflected both in the continuation of the problem of officials not discharging their accounts in full at the end of their tenure and also through the apparent failure of the reforming regime to generate any more cash receipts from the income areas covered by the shire and foreign accounts than had been the case in the mid 1250s. Therefore, it seems that the reforms to the financial administration initiated by the reformers did not produce any overall improvement in the efficiency of the exchequer.

Before 1258, Henry had used the wardrobe as a means of receiving a sizeable share of his income and for expending it. He had elevated the wardrobe to a position in the royal administration by which it appeared to rival the authority of the Chancery and the Exchequer⁸⁶. The last wardrobe account before the revolution in April 1258 was from 10 January 1255 to the 29 April 1256, and during these 15 months wardrobe receipts totalled £16,316 7s 7d⁸⁷, and when set against the yearly totals for exchequer receipts for Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258 (as contained in a previous chapter), the importance of the

⁸⁶T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, vol. i (Manchester, 1920), p. 180-81; Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 10.

⁸⁷E. 372/99, m. 30d.

wardrobe as a means of receipt to the king is demonstrated⁸⁸. However, this account figure probably was not the norm for yearly wardrobe receipts in the 1250s as it was inflated by a 10,000m payment from the Earl of Cornwall as a loan to the king. Even so, the remaining total of the wardrobe receipts for this account, some £10,000, do show what a large percentage of the crown's revenue went through the wardrobe.

Treharne saw the development of the importance of the wardrobe by Henry as a means of escaping baronial control in the 1230s and drawing government more closely under the king's personal supervision. Then, following Henry's assumption of personal rule, as an expedient means of raising and spending money for both household expenses and the costs of campaigning (the exchequer being prone to a more cumbersome accounting procedure)⁸⁹. The wardrobe was, on the whole, directly accountable to the exchequer with the keeper of the wardrobe submitting accounts for his receipts and outgoings to the exchequer to be enrolled on the pipe rolls. However, Henry had at times acquitted his keepers of the wardrobe of accounting at the exchequer. Peter de Rivaux rendered no account for any of his three tenures of this office between 1218 and 1258, Peter of Aigueblanche had likewise also failed to account for his tenure in this office⁹⁰, whilst prior to the revolution in 1258, as stated before, there had been no record for the wardrobe accounts

⁸⁸It must be borne in mind that these yearly totals include wardrobe receipts included as credits on the pipe rolls.

⁸⁹Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, pp. 26-8.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 29; Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History*, pp. 219, 262.

between 30 April 1256 and the 7 July 1258. This failure to account along with the receipt of money from non-exchequer sources, such as by *allocate* and *computate* writs or by prests and loans, threatened the exchequer's administrative control over the wardrobe, especially since, until 1255-57, the wardrobe accounts show that more than five sixths of its income came from sources other than the exchequer⁹¹.

This situation meant that, for the reformers in 1258, control over the exchequer had to be accompanied by supervision of the wardrobe if they wished to fully control royal finance. They had to ensure that the king could not evade, by the use of the Privy Seal and the wardrobe, the hold which the reformers sought to secure by capturing the Chancery⁹². Thus, in the section of the Provisions of Oxford concerning the exchequer and the treasurer, it stated that all the revenues of the land were to go to the exchequer and nowhere else⁹³. Presumably, the intention was for all royal income to be paid into the exchequer with the wardrobe being directly financed by grants out of the exchequer.

However, both the pipe rolls for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261 and the wardrobe account for 8 July 1258 to 25 July 1261 demonstrate that this was not the case. The pipe rolls still record credit allowances to local officials for cash that they had paid into the wardrobe for this period, thus reflecting the continued use of *allocate* writs for directing revenue into the wardrobe. The table below outlines the value of such credits for

⁹¹Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 29.

⁹²Ibid., p. 30.

⁹³*DBM*, p. 107.

the period Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1261 (as taken from the pipe rolls):

Pipe Roll Year	Credits for wardrobe payments		
Mich. 1255-56	£4297		10d
Mich. 1256-57	£3907	1s	6d
Mich. 1257-58	£1844		
Mich. 1258-59	£1328		
Mich. 1259-60	£1032		
Mich. 1260-61	£2546		

Although the reformers did not enforce the Provisions of Oxford concerning all revenue being paid into the exchequer, as demonstrated by the table, the years after Michaelmas 1258 see a fall in the amount of cash paid into the wardrobe which was recorded on the pipe rolls as credit allowances. The vast majority of this decrease related to a fall in such credit allowances for wardrobe payments from the shire accounts. Prior to 1258, judicial receipts, in particular, had provided large cash payments into the wardrobe - approximately £3635 between Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258. With the lack of a comprehensive general eyre during the years of the reformers' control of government such payments into the wardrobe from judicial receipts sank to only £492 for the period Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261, accounting for the overwhelming share of the fall in credits for wardrobe payments⁹⁴.

⁹⁴This figure of £492 is based on credit allowances on the pipe rolls for judicial issues paid into the wardrobe. The wardrobe account for July 1258-

In contrast, payments into the wardrobe from the foreign accounts remained relatively constant after Michaelmas 1258 as compared to the earlier period with £3550 paid into the wardrobe for Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1258 and £3580 for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261. However, for the latter period the majority of cash paid into the wardrobe was accounted for between Michaelmas 1260 and Michaelmas 1261 at a time when reformers were losing and then lost control of the government administration to the king. That the reformers had initially intended to direct all such revenues arising from the foreign accounts into the exchequer is partly demonstrated by a writ from January 1259. The Hampshire sheriff was commanded to receive moneys of the bishopric of Winchester at Hyde and Wolvesey and to deliver the money to the treasurer at the exchequer in Westminster as it had been '*provided by the magnates of the king's council that all moneys arising from the issues of the bishopric should be sent to the Exchequer*'⁹⁵. Yet an examination of Nicholas de Hadlou's account as keeper of the issues of the Winchester bishopric shows that this intention was not carried out. His account for Michaelmas 1258 to Christmas 1260 records £1213 6s 8d as having been paid by him into the wardrobe⁹⁶. Similarly, issues from the exchanges of Canterbury and London, the other major source of foreign account income,

July 1261 records £451 3s 11d as having been paid into the wardrobe from receipts that can be clearly labelled as having been judicial in their source (E. 361/1, m. 1).

⁹⁵CLR, 1251-60, p. 447.

⁹⁶E. 372/104, m. 3, 4.

provided £463 6s 8d for the wardrobe, out of total cash issues of £821 16s 8d, for the period 15 December 1258 to 12 March 1261⁹⁷. Thus the evidence points to the reformers not sticking by intention of ensuring that all crown revenue was to be paid into the exchequer.

The account for the keepers of the wardrobe, Peter of Winchester and Aubrey de Fiscamp, for the period 8 July 1258 to 25 July 1261 highlights just how much money passed through the wardrobe during the period of reform. There are two accounts for this period which have differing figures for the total receipts: the first account giving a figure of £35,700 6s 5. 5d, the second a total of £39,421 18s 8d⁹⁸. The discrepancy seems to be because one account contains money paid to the purchasers of supplies for the wardrobe whilst the other one does not. In both accounts, the major source of revenue was from payments out of the exchequer, a total of £14,508 18s in both cases. Therefore, it can be seen that the bulk of wardrobe receipts (about sixty per cent) came from sources other than the exchequer. The largest receipt of money from non-exchequer sources was £5690 8s 11d received from the French king as part payment of the money he owed to Henry under the terms of the Treaty of Paris. It was this payment into the wardrobe that accounts for the large figure for wardrobe receipts for the Michaelmas 1259-60 financial year as contained in the revenue tables earlier in the chapter. The second largest source of wardrobe revenue was from the king's rights from the church, i.e. revenue received from the issues of vacant bishoprics

⁹⁷E. 372/104, m. 4d

⁹⁸E. 361/1, m. 1, 3.

or from fines made by abbeys to keep their issues during the period of a vacancy. The receipts from these church rights totalled £4841 19s 7d, the majority of which (£2609 19s 11d) came from the issues of the bishopric of Winchester. In fact, the four vacant bishoprics during the period covered by the account (Winchester, Durham, Lincoln and York) supplied all but approximately £450 of such ecclesiastical income. The sale of the king's gold treasure and jewels in France in 1259-60 and in London in 1261 provided Henry with receipts of £2181 0. 5d and £653 13s 4d for the two sales respectively⁹⁹. The other three main areas from which the wardrobe derived its receipts were from loans (approximately £1100), from money that had belonged to the Lusignans (just under £1000), and from £2666 1m sent to the king when he was in France by Hugh Bigod, the justiciar¹⁰⁰.

The wardrobe therefore saw receipts of just under £12,000 a year during the period of reform. However, for these years the majority of revenue paid into the wardrobe was not received direct from the exchequer: £21,192 out of total wardrobe receipts of £35,700 did not come from this source. Of this £21,192, approximately £5000 was audited on the pipe rolls as allowances to local officials for having paid money into the wardrobe. This means that about £16,000 of the revenue contained on this wardrobe account was either not paid from or audited by the exchequer, suggesting that the reformers were unable to enforce

⁹⁹E. 361/1, m. 1.

¹⁰⁰E. 361/1, m. 1.

the demand in the Provisions of Oxford that all revenues should be paid into the exchequer¹⁰¹.

Expenditure during this period can only be calculated at approximate levels. It is only for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 that there are complete exchequer issue rolls for a financial year. Even then, the Michaelmas 1258 issue roll is partly damaged and certain payments out of the exchequer are unreadable, though the total payments for that term are clearly stated and thus it can be worked out that the total value of unreadable entries is about £1243¹⁰². However, the *Liberate Rolls* are more or less complete for the three years and therefore, for expenditure totals, these rolls have to be relied upon. How accurate these *Liberate Roll* figures are as evidence of actual expenditure out of the exchequer is difficult to tell. Since the total issues contained on the two issue rolls for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 differs by less than £200 for the totals of *liberate* writs authorised for that year, it will be assumed that the *Liberate Rolls* are an adequate reflection of expenditure taking

¹⁰¹This occurrence prompts the awkward question of whether, before 1258, the king's income was greatly swollen by cash direct into the wardrobe of which there is no trace. I think that the answer is probably no since the bulk of the large sum for the 1258-61 wardrobe account for payments not accounted through the exchequer was a result of exceptional items which had not been available to the king in the mid 1250s.

¹⁰²This figure has been placed in the miscellaneous category in the issue roll column.

place. The table below shows the relevant totals for the three years plus the figures for pipe roll credits:-

	Issue Rolls ¹⁰³		Liberate Rolls	
	Mich.1258-59	Mich.1258-59	Mich.1259-60	Mich.1260-61
Alms	£200	£42	£65	£5
Wages/Maint	£552	£372	£739	£191
Gift	£426	£498	£365	£405
Building Works	£30	£90	£770	£548
Purchases	£209	£1741	£2100	£3948
Fees	£2369	£2314	£3071	£4811
Admin/Expens.	£446	£550	£360	£512
Miscellaneous	£1778	£217	£4228	£716
Wardrobe	£6438	£6029	£5732	£3961
Debt Repayment	£2283	£2703	£6	£178
TOTAL	£14,735	£14,560	£17,441	£15,279

Pipe Roll Credits

	Mich. 1258-59	Mich. 1259-60	Mich. 1260-61
Alms	£315	£229	£220
Wages/Maint.	£1113	£2144	£1216
Gift	£157	£457	£153
Building Works	£2176	£1933	£1907
Purchase/Munit.	£993	£4075	£377
Pardon	£657	£225	£519
Fee	£353	£2931	£111
Miscellaneous	£3469	£2953	£578

¹⁰³E.403/17B, 3115.

Admin /Expenses	£86	£603	£222
TOTAL	£9318	£15,550	£5303

In the king's grievances against the Council in March 1261, Henry was recorded as stating that he spent less than he used to¹⁰⁴. Yet in the other document of his grievances at this time from March/ April 1261, a contradictory view of his expenditure is given with the statement '*that the king is now spending even more than he used to*'¹⁰⁵. It is this latter statement that the total expenditure figures outlined in the table above back up, as they point to an increase in exchequer outgoings after Michaelmas 1258 compared to the two previous years. These figures probably reflect the increase in revenue received by the exchequer as seen by the receipt roll totals after Michaelmas 1258. A rise in cash receipts would thus have enabled the exchequer to be more forthcoming in the release of money for expenditure purposes. With the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 being broadly similar, it is possible that authorised *liberate* writs were cashed in at the exchequer more or less immediately, in contrast to the years before 1258, as there is little sign on the *Liberate Rolls* of payment problems for the exchequer¹⁰⁶.

¹⁰⁴DBM, p. 213.

¹⁰⁵DBM, p. 221.

¹⁰⁶This similarity for both sets of rolls would thus appear to back up Treharne's point about there being a far more prompt payment of *liberate* writs during the period of reform.

One of the reformers' complaints at Amiens in January 1264 concerned the large payments of fees by the king to '*courtiers, aliens and others*' which had exhausted the '*royal patrimony*'¹⁰⁷. The payment of such fees certainly seems to have decreased with the reformers' period in control of the government administration. Both the *Liberate Rolls* and issue rolls for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 show a fee payment of just over £2300 which was a much reduced sum as compared to similar payments outlined on the issue rolls and *Liberate Rolls* for Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1258. The expulsion of the Lusignans after the Oxford Parliament in 1258 helped to reduce fee payments as the large sums paid out to them by Henry, in lieu of land granted to them, no longer had to be covered. Of the money paid out for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259, a sizeable amount, £1036 18s 4. 5d, went to Simon de Montfort for arrears of his wife's dowry and other debts owed to him by the king. Other than these payments to de Montfort, there are no other large fee payments out of the exchequer for this year. For the following year, Michaelmas 1259-60, the *Liberate Rolls* indicate that fee payments started to increase. The issue roll for the Michaelmas 1259 term backs this up in that fee payments on this roll total £2489 10s 10d and are in excess of fee payments for both terms of the previous financial year. However, this higher figure reflects a 1000m payment to the pope's nuncio for the papacy's yearly tribute for the 42nd year of Henry's reign (October 1257-October 1258) and another 1000m payment which

¹⁰⁷*DBM*, p. 277.

was made to Hugh Bigod for his office of Justiciar¹⁰⁸. Taking these two payments into account, there is no sign of the reforming Council being excessive in its grants of fees. This term along with the two terms from Michaelmas 1258 to Easter 1259 actually record fewer fee payments per term (as enrolled on the issue rolls) out of the exchequer as compared to the four terms between Michaelmas 1256 and Michaelmas 1258. The large fee payment figure on the pipe roll credit table for Michaelmas 1259-60 stems almost entirely from two payments. These payments came out of the issues of the vacant Winchester bishopric and were paid over for the fees of Thomas of Savoy (3000m) and to the king's son-in-law, John of Brittany (1000m)¹⁰⁹.

The large increase in fee payments out of the exchequer for Michaelmas 1260 to Michaelmas 1261, a 36 per cent increase over the previous year, reflects the changing political situation of that period culminating in July 1261 with the king's overthrowing of the reform process. With the issue rolls missing for this year, the *Liberate Rolls* have to be relied upon for the value of fees paid out (from where the above figure comes from) and therefore it cannot be checked as to whether all *liberate* writs issued were actually honoured at the exchequer. The *liberate* writs for this year seemed to have been granted in a fairly standard manner until May 1261, and then, for that month and June, an abnormal number of *liberate* writs, 59 in total, were issued authorising fee payments totalling £1836 10d. Other than two writs of £200 to Simon de Montfort for his wife's dower and

¹⁰⁸E. 403/18, m. 2

¹⁰⁹E. 372/104, mm. 3-4.

1000m for the papal tribute¹¹⁰, these grants by the king could imply that he was trying to build up support in the localities in preparation for his dismissal of officials appointed by the reformers and the replacement of shrieval office holders with his own supporters in July 1261. That this was the case seems to be backed up by evidence in the *Patent Rolls* for March and April 1261 when 27 men were granted yearly sums at the exchequer, varying between 20m and 50m, until the king provided for them 'more abundantly in wards or escheats'¹¹¹. That these 27 were being rewarded with patronage for supporting the king is likely since 5 of those named - Alan la Zuche, Adam de Monte Alto, William la Zuche, John de Muscegros and Adam de Gesemuth- were later appointed as sheriffs by the king in July 1261¹¹².

As with the two years prior to Michaelmas 1258, there is a large discrepancy in the year Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 between the value of *liberate* writs issued for the payment of munitions/ purchases and the actual payments out of the exchequer in this category. It is possible that a large proportion of the unreadable entries on the issue roll for the Michaelmas term of this year could well have been for the payment of munitions and purchases, especially since for all other categories of expenditure the issue roll totals are either approximately equal to those on the *Liberate Rolls* for that year or are larger. Again, the problem of missing issue rolls hinders an analysis. Whether the increasing value of writs issued for payments in this category (as

¹¹⁰CLR, 1260-67, pp. 36, 38.

¹¹¹CPR, 1258-66, p. 147

¹¹²CPR, 1258-66, p. 163-4.

implied by the *Liberate Rolls*) were actually honoured or, as seems to have been the case before 1258, were not given priority payment cannot thus be determined.

Regarding other areas of expenditure, there seems to be nothing notable about the figures. Categories such as gifts, alms and expenses accounted for a relatively small share of total outgoings and are thus unimportant. Admittedly there is a fall in authorised writs for expenditure on building projects for this period. However, since most of these projects were primarily funded through credits on the pipe rolls, usually via the issue of *allocate* and *contrabreve* writs, there is probably nothing notable about this decrease. Cash transfers from the exchequer to the wardrobe went up greatly, possibly reflecting the reformers' desire to make the exchequer the primary department of receipt and hence attempting to make the wardrobe mainly financed from the exchequer. (Analysis of this area of finance is made elsewhere in the chapter). The higher total for the year Michaelmas 1259-60 on the *Liberate Rolls* was caused by the miscellaneous total of £4228, which consisted mainly of payments worth £3266 1m to the king during his stay in France for part of this year. The cost of this trip to the exchequer worked out at £3666 1m¹¹³, of which £2666 1m was accounted for as having been paid into the wardrobe in its account for this period¹¹⁴.

The expenditure category, for issues out of the exchequer, that contains the largest increase for Michaelmas 1258-1259 compared to the three years prior to Michaelmas 1258

¹¹³E. 403/18, m. 1.

¹¹⁴E. 361/1, m. 1

is that for debt repayment. 2300m of this total was paid out to merchants from Florence and Sienna for a loan contracted in May 1258 for 2250m so that the king could pay the pope's yearly tribute for two years. This loan had been taken out with a promise to repay it before Michaelmas 1258¹¹⁵. However, only 1300m was paid during the Michaelmas term 1258¹¹⁶, the rest of the loan plus 50m (presumably interest default) was paid during the Easter term 1259¹¹⁷. The other major loan paid off in this year was one for £550 contracted also in May 1258 from Siennese merchants¹¹⁸, borrowed for the expenses of the king's envoys in Rome, which was paid in full in January 1259¹¹⁹. Both these loans had been taken out at a time of financial difficulties for the crown (as outlined in chapter two), but the meeting of large financial commitments made by Henry prior to the outbreak of reform entailed the borrowing of money well into the reforming regime's tenure in office. 3000m was lent by Florentine merchants to the king in March 1259 for the arrears of the fees of Thomas of Savoy, Amadeus, sometime count of Savoy, and his son Boniface, with leading members of the council acting as sureties for the loan. Repayment was to be at Midsummer 1259 with the money coming out of the issues of Winchester bishopric¹²⁰. The keeper of the bishopric received subsequent mandates on 18 May and the 17

¹¹⁵*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 631.

¹¹⁶*E.* 403/17B, m. 1; *CLR*, 1251-60, p. 437.

¹¹⁷*E.* 403/3115, m. 1; *CLR*, 1251-60, p. 459.

¹¹⁸*CPR*, 1247-58, p. 629.

¹¹⁹*E.* 403/17B, m. 2; *CLR*, 1251-60, p. 447.

¹²⁰*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 17.

July 1259 ordering him to pay over 1000m at first and then another 2000m from the issues for the payment of the loan¹²¹. It is possible that this loan reflected the king's lack of credit worthiness since Council members had to stand as sureties for the loan. However, what is notable is that the bond was drawn up twice, the second time round the sureties of the Earls of Norfolk and Leicester being withdrawn. Another loan from Florentine merchants was contracted by counsel of council members in May 1260 for 780m, of which £100 was for the cancellation of a previous loan contracted with the merchants, 550m was for the merchants to spend on the furtherance of the Scottish king's affairs in Rome (this sum being deducted from the dowry Henry owed the Scottish king), and 80m for the merchants of the king's gift for their grace in lending¹²². Repayment of the loan was fixed for Whitsunday 1261 under a default penalty of 200m. However, this date does not seem to have been met as the only reference to repayment is in June 1262 when a *liberate* writ was issued to the merchants concerned for 780m (no mention being made of any 200m penalty for failing to pay the loan back in time)¹²³. Also in May 1260 the king received a loan of 5000m from the French king, on the pledge of certain jewels, which sum Henry bound over to the Earl of Cornwall in repayment of a loan by him. Henry requested that this loan from the French king should count as part of the first payments which, under the form of peace agreed

¹²¹CPR, 1258-66, pp. 22, 30.

¹²²CPR, 1258-66, p. 71.

¹²³CLR, 1260-67, p. 96.

between England and France, the French king had to make to Henry for the cost of knights¹²⁴.

Henry's trip to France in late 1259 to April 1260 entailed the king borrowing sizeable sums from merchants. A loan for £2800 of Tours from Peter, treasurer of the house of the Temple, Paris, was recorded for January 1260 with a promise to repay before the following Easter, though this repayment date was subsequently set back to a fortnight after Midsummer¹²⁵. Further loans of £1260 of Paris, lent on the security of the king's jewels, and of £500 of new sterling were made in February and April 1260 with repayment dates set for May¹²⁶. In all these three cases, payments to those lending the money have not been traced. No loans seem to have been contracted for the financial year Michaelmas 1260-61, though a loan ordered by the king to be contracted for between 5-7,000m in April 1261 was later cancelled¹²⁷. This probably reflects a lack of need on the king's part to borrow money since, following the peace agreed with the French king, Henry was receiving large sums of money from the French king.

The flight of the Lusignans from England provided the Council and king with an opportunity for using the Lusignans' estates as a means of 'borrowing' money. One of the Council members, Henry of Almain, was given 200m from the king as a loan out of the issues of William de Valence's lands in

¹²⁴*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 74.

¹²⁵*CPR*, 1258-66, pp. 114, 119.

¹²⁶*CPR*, 1258-66, pp. 116, 121,

¹²⁷*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 151.

Northumberland in July 1259. He was supposed to repay this the following Easter but did not do so since a mandate to him in August 1261 instructed him to pay this money back to William¹²⁸. Similarly, Edward, the king's son, was granted 2000m as a loan from the money of Aymer, the Elect of Winchester, for the furtherance of his business in Wales¹²⁹. Alongside these 'loans', money pertaining to the Lusignans was transferred into the wardrobe. £766 1m that William de Valence had deposited at Waltham was transferred in this manner, £600 during the summer of 1258 and £166 1m during the course of the Michaelmas 1260-61 year¹³⁰. Likewise, £120 of the money of the Elect of Winchester was transferred during the Michaelmas 1258-59 year¹³¹.

In general, there does not seem to be anything particularly striking about the exchequer expenditure totals for 1258-61. Although, the totals for the *Liberate Rolls* are all higher than those for the two years Michaelmas 1256 to Michaelmas 1258, the increases appear to be mainly due to the larger transfers of cash from the exchequer to the wardrobe and (in 1259-60) the transfer of money to the king in France. If there is anything of note, it lies with the changes in the payment totals for fees, the trend in this category suggesting that such payments were an important means for the king to buy support, i.e. when

¹²⁸CPR, 1258-66, pp. 33, 171,

¹²⁹CPR, 1258-66, p. 6.

¹³⁰E. 361/1, m. 1.

¹³¹E. 361/1, m. 1.

the reformers were in power such payments were low, but as the king regained power during 1261 these payments went up.

Some of the magnates associated with the reforming regime did not do that badly in terms of financial and landed remuneration during their tenure of power. Of the Council, it was Simon de Montfort who benefited the most. In May 1258, following the king's acceptance of reform, the Council agreed to decide about the assignment of lands to de Montfort '*for the yearly fee and debts wherein the king is bound to him*'¹³². The fee referred to was the £400 that de Montfort received yearly until Henry could provide him with lands to that value, whilst the debts were for money owed to him by the king for de Montfort's time as seneschal of Gascony, for dower payments from the Marshal heirs, and for problems concerning the county of Bigorre¹³³. As mentioned earlier, de Montfort was able to extract crown land in 1259 in lieu of the £400 fee. Along with this, he received large payments from the exchequer towards covering the king's debts to him and his outstanding fees. £1036 18s 4. 5d was paid to him at the Easter 1259 exchequer and a further £200 at the Michaelmas 1259 exchequer¹³⁴. Further payments of 100m, £200 and £200 were authorised to him during the year Michaelmas

¹³²CPR, 1247-58, p. 627.

¹³³D. A. Carpenter, 'Simon de Montfort: The First Leader of a Political Movement in English History', *History*, lxxvi (1991), p. 18; Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort*, pp. 130-135.

¹³⁴E. 403/3115, m.1; E. 403/18, m. 1.

1259-60¹³⁵, and one for £200 in May 1261¹³⁶. Therefore, assuming that all his authorised *liberate* writs were honoured at the exchequer, de Montfort received £1903 11s 8. 5d during the period of reform. On top of this, de Montfort committed the county of Bigorre to the king for seven years from the Assumption 1259 on the condition that the king paid him £1000 by the 1st November 1259 at the Temple, Paris, for his expenses in keeping the county¹³⁷.

It has thus been queried whether de Montfort's initial support for the reform movement was dictated by a desire to extract his dues in full which had not been easily forthcoming under the king's personal rule¹³⁸. Henry was in fact to accuse de Montfort in 1260 of putting private gain before public profit when he argued that de Montfort used the negotiations over peace with the French king to push forward his claims concerning the settlement of his financial claims against the king¹³⁹. Simon certainly benefited financially in the three years after Spring 1258 in what could possibly be interpreted in a manner as being against the spirit of the reforms promulgated. Yet it can also be argued that all Simon was doing was claiming and receiving debts that were owed to him by the crown, and, after all, the reforming regime had as one of its aims the reduction of the king's debts. In de Montfort's defence, he did not receive during this period any

¹³⁵CLR, 1251-60, pp. 496, 500, 532.

¹³⁶CLR, 1260-67, p. 36.

¹³⁷CPR, 1258-66, p. 38.

¹³⁸Carpenter, 'Simon de Montfort', p. 18.

¹³⁹DBM, pp. 195-205.

form of patronage or payment to which he had not been previously entitled to - it was not until his assumption of power after the Battle of Lewes in 1264 that he started receiving large grants of land.

After Simon de Montfort, it was Hugh Bigod who received the largest remuneration of the reformers. For his tenure in office as justiciar he received 1000m yearly¹⁴⁰. Alongside this office he held other positions of responsibility: the keeping of Dover castle, the keeping of the Cinque Ports, the chamberlainship of Sandwich, and the keeping of Scarborough castle¹⁴¹. In total, *liberate* and *allocate* writs worth 2450m were granted to Hugh for these offices¹⁴². However, a large share of this total would have gone towards expenses associated with the keeping of these positions, though Hugh did benefit in other ways. In January 1259 he had his claim to land called Broken Wharf in the parish of St. Mary in Somerset granted¹⁴³, whilst in November 1259 he was granted the wardship of the lands and heirs of William de Kyme in return for a £3000 fine¹⁴⁴. It cannot be alleged that Hugh was enriching himself since, with the exception of the wardship, he was being paid for the pursuit of administrative duties. However, with the holding of so many offices and the grant of this large wardship, Hugh, in all probability, did very well financially out of the reforming regime.

¹⁴⁰CLR, 1251-60, p. 446.

¹⁴¹CPR, 1258-66, pp. 42, 70.

¹⁴²CLR, 1251-60, pp. 446, 492, 508; CLR, 1260-67, p. 2.

¹⁴³CChR, 1257-1300, pp. 16-17.

¹⁴⁴E. 371/24, m. 1; CPR, 1258-66, p. 60.

Grants to other members of the Council do not appear to have been excessive. Roger Bigod was given Brandeston manor following the death of its previous holder, John Welond, in October 1259¹⁴⁵. Most grants were of offices or administration duties, such as the grant of several castles to Council members in the summer of 1258¹⁴⁶. Non-administrative grants and patronage to Council members started to occur during the course of 1260. Henry of Almain was given a fee of £100 a year at the exchequer in June of that year¹⁴⁷, likewise Earl Warenne had been give a similar grant three months earlier in March¹⁴⁸, Roger de Mortimer one of 60m a year in August¹⁴⁹, and James de Audley one of £40 a year in October¹⁵⁰. James was then given '*by counsel of council magnates*' the wardship of the lands late of Isabel Basset in November 1260, his fee at the Exchequer being cancelled¹⁵¹. Hugh Despenser was given 50m a year at the Exchequer until provided for in wards and escheats in October¹⁵². The Earl of Warwick was given the seisin of Kidlington manor in exchange for a 400m fine¹⁵³. However, these grants do not really suggest that the Council used the reform process and the overthrow of the king's authority to

¹⁴⁵*CChR*, 1257-1300, p. 22.

¹⁴⁶*DBM*, p. 113.

¹⁴⁷*CPR*, 1258-66, pp. 79, 123.

¹⁴⁸*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 123.

¹⁴⁹*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 86.

¹⁵⁰*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 98.

¹⁵¹*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 127.

¹⁵²*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 124.

¹⁵³*CLR*, 1260-67, p. 54.

enrich themselves. The timing of the grants suggests as much. Unlike the grants to Simon de Montfort, these grants do not stem from the beginning of the reformers' tenure in power. Rather, they came at a time, during 1260, when the Council and reform process was losing ground in its political authority and civil war was being threatened. It can be suspected that these grants, with the exception of the one to Hugh Despenser, reflect the turbulent political situation and the possibility of the king trying to draw certain Council members firmly onto his side, especially since most of these grants went to Council members who had been selected by the king back in 1258.

The evidence points towards the period of reform as seeing both the king's revenue and expenditure going up. Yet the increase in revenue seems to have been generated from sources such as the sale of the royal treasure and the receipt of monies from the French king, sources of revenue which were outside the remit of the pipe rolls and were not part of the 'ordinary' income of the crown. These particular revenues having nothing to do with any policy being pursued by the reformers. On a similar theme, the large sums contributed to the exchequer and wardrobe by the vacancies at Durham and Winchester, which overshadowed any similar contributions from ecclesiastical vacancies in the years before reform, can be seen as chance factors. Therefore, the reformers cannot really be said to have had any success in the area of increasing the king's revenue. However, at least revenue did not collapse under the reformers which suggests that the regime was able to maintain central government authority in the financial sphere.

In the reformers' favour, they do not seem to have embarked on any wasteful patronage or disbursement of royal financial resources, though the grants to Simon de Montfort could, as mentioned before, be interpreted as going against the ideals of the reforming movement. There is a small amount of evidence suggesting that they made attempts to improve the efficiency of the financial administration and to curtail areas of wasteful expenditure. However, these attempts do not appear to have been particularly successful and, given that the reformers had a comparatively short time at the helm of the government administration, it is therefore perhaps not really surprising that major improvements in efficiency were not gained.

Chapter 5

Henry's Regaining and Loss of Power, 1261-3

The overthrowing of the reform process and the re-establishment of the king's effective control over the government administration, which Henry put into practice during the course of 1261, did not last that long. By the summer of 1263, the king's authority had collapsed and the reform-minded magnates led by Simon de Montfort were able to reintroduce some of the policies from the years 1258-60 which Henry III had rejected. Since this period of royal control over the administration was relatively short, there are problems in coming to any conclusions about the financial aspects of Henry's recovery of power. These problems stem from both missing financial records and from the political turmoil of the period which greatly affected the compilation of government administrative records.

A very approximate estimate of royal revenue for the period Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263 can be arrived at from the pipe rolls. However, the only receipt roll for this period is that for Easter 1263 and therefore it is impossible to arrive at any yearly cash flow figures for both these years to compare with the audit figures on the pipe rolls. Thus, one must rely on the pipe rolls for determining crown income. Unfortunately, those pipe roll

figures arrived at suffer from certain irregularities that cannot be easily be overcome. This stems from the increasing infrequency of shrieval accounting at the exchequer which started to occur from Michaelmas 1261. Three counties did not have their accounts for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263 audited until several years after Michaelmas 1263: Hereford's accounts were not audited until the 1267-8 pipe roll was drawn up whilst the audits for Surrey/ Sussex and Salop/ Staffordshire were not heard until the 1266-7 pipe roll¹. Thus the revenue that has been attributed to these three counties for the adjusted Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263 revenue tables does not necessarily reflect the actual cash paid into either the exchequer or the wardrobe from their issues for these two years².

The problem of belated audits for shire accounts is not a great problem for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 since, with the exception of the three above mentioned counties, the majority of shire accounts were audited on the pipe roll for this year with the remainder being audited on the two subsequent pipe rolls. Thus any discrepancies between the revenue figures attributed to Michaelmas 1261-Michaelmas 1262 and what was actually paid into the wardrobe and exchequer can be assumed to be relatively minor.

However, the situation for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 changes dramatically. Only a minority of shire

¹E. 372/ 111, mm. 5, 7d, 8d, 11-12d, 15, 16, 17d, 18d, 45-46d; E. 372/ 112, mm. 19-20d, 22d.

²These cases reflect the inadequacy of the pipe rolls for determining yearly revenue which has been pointed out in chapter 1.

accounts for this latter year were audited on the pipe roll for that year. The pipe roll for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262, drawn up between Michaelmas 1262 and the summer of 1263, called to audit and recorded the accounts for 19 sheriffs, a figure comparable to those for shrieval attendance at the exchequer of audit for the years of reform³. In contrast, the Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 pipe roll, drawn up between Michaelmas 1263 and February 1264, records the attendance of only 9 sheriffs at the exchequer of audit⁴. This low figure obviously reflects the political situation of the time in that, when the upper exchequer opened in the Autumn of 1263 to hear the accounts for this latter year, the country was on the verge of civil war. In addition, from its opening in Michaelmas 1263, there was no treasurer or resident baron sitting at the exchequer until November 1263 when a provisional administration was set up under John Chishull⁵. The exchequer closed in February 1264 with there being no Easter session⁶. The last shire account was audited on the 6th February 1264⁷. Thus, with so many shire accounts not being heard until several years after the financial year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, the revenue totals that have been attributed to the categories of income for this year are highly tentative. These low attendance figures at the audit reflect

³M. H. Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", 1258-72', *EHR*, xxxvi (1921), p. 488.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 488.

⁵T. F. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England* (Manchester, 1920), vol. 1, p. 297.

⁶Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", p. 489.

⁷E. 369/38, m. 12d.

the political and financial situation after Michaelmas 1263 and will thus be discussed in the next chapter on the civil war.

Financial administration seems to have been fairly normal for most of the year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 as 23 sheriffs made proffers at either or both of the Easter 1263 and Michaelmas 1263 *Adventi Vicecomitum* towards clearing their debts for this year - it was just the outbreak of civil war that disrupted the audit of their accounts⁸. Therefore, one can only get a clear picture of Henry's financial position, following his regaining of power, from the one year Michaelmas 1261-62.

Despite any problems associated with the compilation of revenue tables for these two years, it seems fair to conclude that royal revenue dropped quite dramatically after Michaelmas 1262. The adjusted revenue table below suggests a fall of around 50 per cent and 45 per cent in both cash revenue and total notional income respectively for the Michaelmas 1262-63 year as compared to the previous year. Similarly, the actual revenue tables for the two years show a sizeable fall for the latter year, though the decrease is larger for both the cash receipts and total notional income categories.

<u>Shire Accounts</u>	Adjusted Revenue		Actual Revenue	
	Mich.1261-62	Mich.1262-3	Mich.1261-2	Mich.1262-3
Shire Issues	£1164	£528	£1418	£416
Demesne	£3925	£2575	£4439	£1757
Judicial	£3020	£722	£3436	£576
Debts	£883	£520	£1005	£376

⁸Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", p. 492.

Jews	£51	£10	£55	£9
Feudal	£189	£372	£278	£74
Taxation	£534	£282	£664	£256
Forest	£197	£279	£149	£187
Miscellaneous	£426	£1540	£425	£1533
TOTAL(Shire Acc.)	£10,389	£6828	£11,869	£5184
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>				
Eccl. Vacancies	£2593	£665	£4430	-
Demesne	£250	£115	£100	-
Forest	£225	-	-	-
Mint/Exchange	£868	£1030	£1223	-
Miscellaneous	-	-	-	-
Escheats/Seisins	£117	£94	£103	-
TOTAL(For. Acc.)	£4053	£1904	£5856	-
PIPE ROLL TOTAL	£14,442	£8732	£17,725	£5184
Misc. Cash	-	-	-	-
Wardrobe Cash	£11,602	£3825	£11,602	£3825
TOTAL CASH	£26,044	£12,557	£29,327	£9009
CREDITS	£6753	£5086	£7195	£2174
TOTAL NOTIONAL				
INCOME	£32,797	£17,643	£36,522	£11,183

The revenue recorded above for the adjusted revenue table for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 is notable in that it shows a high figure for cash receipts and total notional income as compared to the average for the years prior to Michaelmas 1261. Although the level of pipe roll receipts for this year is fairly constant as compared to the equivalent figures for the three previous years, it is through receipts into the wardrobe that these

figures were boosted for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262. The wardrobe account that covers this year is contained on the Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1269 pipe roll and consists of an audit of the wardrobe receipts between 26th July 1261 to 31st December 1264⁹. Enrolled in this account are receipts totalling £9340 10d which were paid to Henry by the French king as part of the peace deal agreed between the two kings and it is these receipts that explain the large cash figure for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263.

Revenue for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 fell in all the dominant categories of revenue as compared to the equivalent figures for the Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 year. The reasons for this must lie with the disturbances occurring within the realm from the end of 1262. In November 1262, revolt broke out in the Marches with Herefordshire, in particular, being subject to devastation from the Welsh¹⁰. This would explain why no Hereford account for 1261-2 was heard and audited on the pipe roll for that year and why the Hereford sheriff's representative at the Easter 1263 *Adventus Vicecomitum* paid no proffer for the county¹¹. Along with Hereford, the other counties bordering the Welsh marches - Gloucester, Worcester and Salop/Stafford - all showed reduced receipts for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 on their pipe roll audits as compared to previous years.

⁹E. 372/113, m. 3-4.

¹⁰R. F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-1263* (Manchester, 1971), p. 291-3.

¹¹E. 368/37, m. 24d

However, the political troubles of 1263 did not totally disrupt crown income throughout the country for the Michaelmas 1262-63 year, as can partly be seen in the case of Kent and the income that was produced from that county despite the exploits of Roger de Leybourne. The quarrel between Edward, the king's son, and Roger, who had been disseized of his lands following a complaint that he was guilty of misappropriating funds in his position as Edward's steward, led to Roger stirring up trouble¹². Becoming an outlaw, Roger gathered armed men around him and returning to Kent, where many of his former estates lay, proceeded to plunder royal manors during the early part of 1263¹³. It could be expected that the result of Roger's actions in Kent would have depleted the king's income from this county. However, the revenue figures for Kent for this year portray a mixed picture. The pipe roll account for Kent for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 records no income paid into either the exchequer or the wardrobe from the Kent shire issues. Instead, it states that the remainder of the county farm (some £33 18s 8. 5d bl. and £165 1m numero) was not summoned for payment, i.e. the sheriff was acquitted¹⁴. This possibly suggests that Roger de Leybourne's behaviour had contributed to the sheriff not being

¹²*The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, vol. II, ed. W. Stubbs (London, 1880), p. 220-1; Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 286; M. Prestwich, *Edward I* (London, 1988), p. 37. Prestwich states that the sheriff of Kent was ordered to raise £1820 from Leybourne's lands, this being the sum for which Leybourne had failed to account for properly.

¹³Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 296.

¹⁴E. 372/107, m. 13d.

able to raise enough money to cover the county farm. However, other evidence from the pipe rolls at this time provides a contrasting picture. The pipe roll for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 records Robert Walerand, the sheriff for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, as having paid £123 19s 4d towards the county increment for 1262-3¹⁵. Demesne issues for Kent for this year do not show any significant decrease (though they never contributed much to the king anyway), whilst judicial receipts show an increase for the county on the previous year. This judicial increase in income reflected the eyre held in the county by Nicholas Tower which, fortunately for the king, was held at the end of 1262 and the very beginning of 1263, before Leybourne started causing trouble¹⁶. Taken as a whole, the audited accounts for Kent for both Michaelmas 1262-1263 and the two subsequent years up to Michaelmas 1265 suggest a mixed picture as regards the income received by the king from this county during this time. This then leads on to the proposition that perhaps the revolt of Roger de Leybourne did not have such damaging effects on crown income as some of the writings of the time suggest.

More generally, other sources of evidence suggest that income to the crown was in fact heavily influenced by the disruption during 1263. For example, this is implied by the only

¹⁵E. 372/109, m. 17d. It seems strange that the Kent sheriff for Michaelmas 1262-63 should be pardoned part of the county farm yet still pay money for the county increment.

¹⁶D. Crook, *Records of the General Eyre*, PRO Handbooks 20 (London, 1982), p. 131

surviving receipt roll for this period, that of Easter 1263, whose receipts are noted below:-

Easter 1263 Receipt Roll¹⁷

Demesne	£1312
Judicial	£442
Sheriffs	£1300
Debts	£383
Jews	£38
Feudal	£103
Taxation	£15
Forest	£29
Miscellaneous	£56
TOTAL	£3678

The total receipts on this roll are the lowest for any exchequer term of the receipt rolls that remain for the period Michaelmas 1256 to Easter 1263, thus inferring that the disorders of the first half of 1263 severely affected the amount of cash being paid into the lower exchequer. Therefore, this receipt roll evidence would appear to back up the figures from the pipe roll revenue tables that crown income for Michaelmas 1262-63 was much depleted as compared to the previous year.

As can be seen from the pipe roll revenue table, the amount of cash income audited as coming from the county farms and increments decreased between Michaelmas 1261 to

¹⁷E.401/45A.

Michaelmas 1263 from the totals for the preceding three years (as noted in the previous chapter). These decreases were accompanied by falls in the levels of fixed increments assigned to the sheriffs during this period, £1916 13s 4d for 1261-2¹⁸ and £1718 6s 8d for 1262-3¹⁹. The falls in both liable and actual revenue from shire issues reflect the continual changing in the value of the increments which the sheriffs had to account for at the exchequer and also in the terms on which these sheriffs held office. These changes stemmed from both the recovery of power by the king in 1261 and then his subsequent loss of it during the course of 1263.

Henry had made his bid for independence from the reforming regime during the Spring and Summer of 1261. In July of that year, he had ordered the replacement of 21 sheriffs in the shires²⁰. This was a move that was unpopular in the localities as *'the provincials of the counties....vigorously repelled the new sheriff-overlords (vicedominos) and did not wish to be intendant on them or answerable to them'*²¹. This opposition was demonstrated through eight counties, which had been given a new sheriff by Henry in July with the command to the incumbent

¹⁸Figures contained in E. 372/106, 107, 111, 112. Sums are missing on the pipe rolls for Nottingham/ Derby and Salop/ Staffs.

¹⁹Figures contained in E. 372/ 107, 108, 111, 112, 114. Sums are missing for Gloucester, Warwick/ Leicester, Nottingham/ Derby and Salop/ Staffs.

Lancashire no longer appears on the pipe rolls after Michaelmas 1262.

²⁰CPR, 1258-66, p. 162-4. Worcester, London/ Middlesex and Buckingham/ Bedford were the counties excepted.

²¹*Flores Historiarum*, ii, ed. H. R. Luard (London, 1890), pp. 473-4.

sheriff to hand over his office immediately, not having this change reflected in their county accounts on the pipe rolls, i.e. the sheriff for the first half of the year rendered account for the second half of the year. These counties were Warwick/ Leicester, Oxford/ Berkshire, Lincoln, Somerset/ Dorset, Hereford, Cumberland and Surrey/ Sussex. However, in the case of Surrey/ Sussex this came about because the king's appointment, William la Zuche, was taken ill and the sheriff, John de Wauton, whom the king had intended to replace, was commanded to stay in office until the end of the year²². The other thirteen counties had this change reflected in their pipe roll accounts with the sheriffs appointed by the king rendering account on the pipe rolls for the second half of the financial year 1260-1²³. In seven of these thirteen cases, the newly appointed sheriff was given a changed increment for the county farm as compared to that rendered by the previous sheriff. Gloucester was given a higher increment whilst Hampshire, Devon, Salop/ Staffs, York, Cambridge/ Hunts and Wiltshire were given a lower increment. The remaining counties of these thirteen maintained the same increment after the shrieval changes, though, in the case of Nottingham/ Derby, a figure cannot be traced on the pipe rolls for liable increment for the second half of the year. Buckingham/ Bedford maintained the same sheriff, Alexander de Hamden, for Michaelmas 1259 to Michaelmas 1261

²²*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 168.

²³However, in the cases of Wiltshire and Cambridge/ Huntingdon, the sheriffs chosen by Henry commenced their accounts from the last quarter of this financial year.

as it did for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263, but with a lower increment being rendered for the latter two years.

That six of the counties having a change in the shrieval office in 1261 had their new sheriffs rendering for lower increments could possibly signify that the king was trying to pacify opposition to himself. It also shows the truth of Henry's statement in his letter of August 1261 to the counties when, on appointing the new sheriffs, he commented that he had done this for the utility of the localities rather than for his own gain and that '*this you can surely perceive from the fact that it behoves us to retain the majores (the new sheriffs) at our cost, a cost more than that at which we could have had and are accustomed to have*'²⁴. Henry was here referring to the fact that the new sheriffs were great *curiales*. These new sheriffs were being allowed a larger part of the county revenue, through the form of lower fixed increments, so as to enable them to afford and maintain a more powerful local presence, a necessity for Henry in his bid to overturn the changes introduced by the reforming movement.

It is also notable that none of the eight counties that had successfully opposed the king's shrieval nominations in July 1261 suffered from higher increments between Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263. Four of these counties, those of Lincoln, Northants, Cumberland and Somerset/ Dorset, maintained the same increment for these two years as they had done for Michaelmas 1260 to Michaelmas 1261. Surrey/ Sussex and

²⁴ 'Royal Letters to all the counties of England', *Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et cujuscunque generis Acta Publica*, ed. T. Rymer, vol. I part i (Record Commission, 1816), p. 408-9.

Hereford had their increments reduced for the year Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262, though in the latter case this change came after the first quarter of the year, whilst Warwick/ Leicester and Oxford/ Berkshire maintained the same increment for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 but have no liable increment figures recorded for them on the pipe rolls for the subsequent year. In the case of Warwick/Leicester, the sheriff accounted '*ut custos*' for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 and therefore it would appear that he did not generate any variable profits for the exchequer out of his shire issues. Only two counties were given higher increments after Michaelmas 1261. Norfolk/ Suffolk had its increment raised from 300m to 400m for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, a level equal to its pre-reform figure. The second county was Cambridge/ Hunts. The sheriff installed by Henry in July 1261 had been given a reduced increment level. However, from Michaelmas 1261 the increment liable reverted back to its figure of before July 1261.

Henry's loss of power and acceptance of the demands of the reformers in July 1263, along with the reformers' initial victory in the civil war, was to result in a change of policy regarding the administration of the shire issues with the re-introduction of custodial sheriffs accounting for variable profits. This change was not comprehensive for all the counties and occurred mainly after Michaelmas 1263 and will thus be discussed in fuller detail in the next chapter. However, four counties were affected by the use of custodial sheriffs for the year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, as shown by the accounts on the pipe rolls. The Warwick/ Leicester accounts were rendered '*ut custos*' by its sheriff for the whole of this year, Essex/ Herts for

the second half of the year with Gloucester and Yorkshire accounting in this manner for the last quarter. That these four counties accounted in this way raises some interesting points about the policy (if there was such a policy) of using custodial sheriffs. The dates for the appointments of the sheriffs concerned do not coincide with the dates on which Henry handed over power to the reformers. The originalia rolls record the 10th July 1263 as being the day Henry officially handed power over to the reforming magnates under Simon de Montfort²⁵. Yet the Warwick/ Leicester sheriff, William Bagod, had been holding office since Michaelmas 1262, whilst the appointment of John de Bocking as a custodian to the Essex/ Herts shrieval office was made on the 25th March 1263²⁶, with Robert de Neville's appointment as custodial sheriff to Yorkshire being made on the 13th June 1263²⁷. That these appointments were made before Henry's surrender of power could possibly suggest that Henry had been trying out a policy of limited custodial sheriffs. There could be nothing surprising about this since Henry had, from time to time, introduced the occasional custodial sheriff at times when fixed increments for the shires was the standard accounting procedure, for example, Lincoln in the last quarter of 1256-7. However, it might also suggest that Henry, in the months prior to when he gave up power, was trying to pacify certain shires through shoring up his power base by introducing a policy of custodial sheriffs which had been a demand of the localities at the

²⁵E. 371/27, m. 11.

²⁶E. 371/27, m. 6; C. 60/60, m. 8

²⁷E. 371/27, m. 9.

time of reform in 1258. By appealing to local grievances, Henry hoped to curtail opposition to his regime. If this was the case it was not comprehensive as the vast majority of sheriffs remained as non-custodial office holders, whilst not all the newly appointed sheriffs in the months before July 1263 were ordered to render for variable profits. For example, Roger de Loges was given the shrieval office for Surrey/ Sussex for the second half of the financial year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 with the terms of rendering for the same fixed increment as his predecessor, William la Zuche²⁸.

The change of sheriff in Gloucester before July 1263 does not seem, on the basis of available evidence, to have been any intention of the king's since no commands have been traced by which Henry ordered a change to the Gloucester shrieval office. Instead the change appears to reflect the results of the uprising in the Marches. This uprising having broken out following Henry's refusal to bow down to the barons' demands for him to observe the Provisions of Oxford²⁹. The sheriff replaced, Mattias Bezil, was a foreigner and had been one of the sheriffs appointed by Henry in July 1261³⁰. His replacement as sheriff, according to the pipe rolls was Roger de Clifford, who was one of the Marcher lords involved in the uprising against Henry's rule³¹. The chronicle of Robert of Gloucester comments on this change of sheriff that Bezil was a French knight who had been appointed Gloucester sheriff

²⁸E. 371/27, m. 7.

²⁹Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 301.

³⁰CPR, 1258-66, p. 162.

³¹Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, p. 301.

by the king and that the barons had decreed that this was against the purveyance (the Provisions of Oxford) as they would have no Frenchman. They therefore instead replaced him with the local knight William Tracy³². Whether Bezil was in fact replaced in 1263 simply on the grounds that he had been appointed in disregard of the Provisions of Oxford is debatable. Rather it is far more likely that he was deposed from his office by the rebels on the grounds that he was an important supporter of the king and that, as constable of the castle of Gloucester, he was in control of a strategically important area. However, it is noticeable that his successor was placed in office as a custodial sheriff, an appointment commensurate with the Provisions of Oxford with its demand for such sheriffs³³.

The reformers' resumption of power, limited as it was by the unstable political situation, did not see a full scale change of sheriffs. The majority of shrieval office holders in July 1263 continued as sheriffs well into the following financial year. The originalia rolls only record one shrieval change in the year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 occurring after July 1263. This was for Salop/ Staffs with the new sheriff being appointed on 10th August 1263. This sheriff, Hamo Lestrangle, was not ordered to render for variable profits but instead was given the same

³²*The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, Part II*, ed. W. A. Wright (London, 1887), p. 736. However, there is no record in the pipe rolls of Tracy having served as Gloucester sheriff at this time.

³³E. 372/109, m. 21. This records Roger de Clifford as rendering '*ut custos*' for Gloucester.

fixed increment as his predecessor, James de Audley³⁴. That there was only one shrieval change immediately and that variable profits were not introduced immediately begs questions about the reformers' administrative intentions when they regained power. However, this point will be discussed in the next chapter. That there was a lack of widespread shrieval change in the months after July 1263 could reflect the relative political unimportance of the shrieval office in the events of this time. In the immediate aftermath of the king's handing over of power, it was in the keepership of castles that the largest number of office changes were seen, not the shrieval office³⁵. Part of the reason for this lack of widespread shrieval change in the months after July 1263 probably lies in the political events of the Autumn of 1263 and hence will be discussed in the next chapter.

Only limited comments can be made on the individual categories of revenue since the unstable political situation in 1263 and 1264 had major effects on exchequer administration (as will be discussed in the next chapter) and, with the outbreak of civil war, revenue can be expected to have declined dramatically. The tables suggest this is exactly what happened. Income from the shires dropped slightly between Michaelmas 1261 and Michaelmas 1262 as compared to the average annual income from this area of the pipe rolls for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261 but not by any large enough amount to warrant any major comment. It was through the foreign account receipts that

³⁴E. 371/27, m. 11.

³⁵E. 371/27, m. 11; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 271.

revenue for this year was boosted to a figure equivalent to the years of reform.

An aside here is that the pipe roll figures for receipts from the shire accounts show a downward trend from the mid 1250s onwards. This might possibly signify that a gradual erosion in the income that the king could raise from the shires occurred between then and Michaelmas 1262. However, since the receipt rolls that survive do not suggest that this was the case, another explanation might lie with the possibility that an increasing amount of the king's income was not being recorded on the pipe rolls.

The categories of revenue that saw the greatest falls in value after Michaelmas 1262 were those for demesne issues and for judicial receipts. The latter category, as ever, was influenced by the receipts from the general eyre. Eyre visitations resumed in the early part of 1262 with Nicholas Tower starting his circuit in Buckinghamshire in January of that year³⁶. The vast majority of the counties that were visited by the justices on eyre had their sessions held during the course of 1262 which accounts for the larger judicial revenue figures for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262. Although the eyre was abandoned during 1263, the judicial revenue figures attributed to that year in the revenue tables do underestimate the amount of revenue raised. Again, this results from the problem of shrieval audit at the exchequer, though it only affects a few counties. For example, Surrey/ Sussex was visited by itinerant justices at the end of 1262 but the proceeds of the eyre were not recorded on the pipe rolls until the

³⁶D. Crook, *Records of the General Eyre*, p. 130.

Michaelmas 1266-Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll³⁷, and therefore it is impossible to tell what percentage of the eyre receipts from these counties actually came into the exchequer or wardrobe during the year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263.

As with the period of reform, the total amount of receipts from the eyre was much reduced from that received during the mid 1250s, reflecting the fact that a minority of the shires were covered by the eyre - there only being ten counties where justices on eyre sat to hear cases³⁸. The seven year limit for the visitation of justices, as discussed in the last chapter, was not fully abided by in the administration of the eyre. Nicholas Tower, in his circuit, seems to have kept to this limit by not visiting any counties that had hosted an eyre visitation within the past seven years, though Robert Briwes's circuit in the South West of the country entailed him visiting counties that had received previous general eyres inside the last ten years³⁹. The increasing instability in the Marches resulted in the eyre being suspended in May 1263, though further sessions in June and in September were held in three counties⁴⁰. These were to be the last cases heard by justices on eyre until after the civil war in 1268.

As with the years of reform, the revenue figures for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 show how much the king

³⁷Ibid., p. 132.

³⁸Ibid., p. 129-33. Counties such as Surrey/ Sussex with one sheriff for both counties have only been counted as one shire.

³⁹Ibid., p. 128-9. Crook attributes Briwes's case as a possible indication of the power of Richard of Cornwall in the West.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 128-33.

benefited from ecclesiastical vacancies. The overwhelming share of the income from this category came from the vacancy at Winchester which finally came to an end on 24th August 1262⁴¹. The account for the bishopric from 25th December 1260 to 24th August 1262 records a total of £4307 6s 7d as having been paid into the exchequer and wardrobe from the issues of the bishopric, the vast majority of which went direct into the wardrobe⁴². It can be assumed that most of this sum was received after Michaelmas 1261 since the wardrobe accounts for July 1261 to December 1265 record £2887 19s 11d as having been received by the wardrobe from the Winchester vacancy between the dates of the wardrobe account⁴³. However, this vacancy, although over, did provide the king with a sizeable amount of money after Michaelmas 1262. The *Patent Rolls* for January 1263 record a notification that the Bishop of Winchester, in part satisfaction of the £2229 13s 1d which he owed for the purchase of corn and stock of the bishopric which he had received from the king after the restitution of the temporalities, had paid £1000 into the exchequer just after Hilary 1263. The notification goes on to state that the Bishop was to pay another £1000 at the rate of 250m half-yearly with the residue being pardoned⁴⁴. The Hampshire county account for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 records the bishop as having paid £1533 6s 8d of this amount into the

⁴¹E. 372/106, m. 41.

⁴²E. 372/106, m. 41.

⁴³E. 372. 113, m. 3.

⁴⁴*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 242. (Also mentioned in the originalia rolls, E. 371/27, m. 3.).

exchequer during the course of that year's account⁴⁵. This sum has been recorded in the miscellaneous section of the shire accounts for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, hence the large figure for the miscellaneous category in that year's revenue table. The only other bishopric that has an account for its vacancy during this period is London for the period 16th July 1262 to the 15th January 1263, which contributed £324 8s 1. 5d into the exchequer⁴⁶.

Of the other foreign account categories, mint/exchange issues produced the second highest figure for receipts, though this was fairly standard. The rise in foreign account demesne issues for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 over the totals for the previous five years is probably a quirk. The forest issue figure for the same year reflects the result of wood sales, the Michaelmas 1261 *communia* in the memoranda rolls having ordered several sheriffs to get the officials assigned to these sales to render their accounts⁴⁷.

According to the pipe rolls, receipts from feudal rights declined overall between Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263 as compared to the previous three years. As regards the number of large fines made for such rights, the year Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 sees very few. The highest was one for 735m 5s 5d made by Belia, late the wife of Peitevin de Bedford, a Jew, for having the estate of her husband⁴⁸. In January 1262, William la

⁴⁵E. 372/107, m. 16d.

⁴⁶E. 372/108, m. 30d.

⁴⁷E. 368/36, m. 1d.

⁴⁸E. 371/26, m. 2; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 192.

Zuche was granted the marriage of the heirs of Isabel, late the wife of Reynold de Mohun, for 200m. His yearly fee of 40m was to be allowed to him in the said fine until the fine was paid⁴⁹. For Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 the situation changes and an increase in such fines can be seen. Robert de Bennis, a yeoman of Edward, the king's son, made a 200m fine for the marriage rights of the son and heir of Hugh de Bolebek⁵⁰. William de Arden and his wife Matilda were fined 100m for marrying without licence⁵¹. John Mansel made a fine for £100 for the custody of the lands and tenants of Alard de Fleming⁵². Five fines for £100 each were recorded after March 1263 for the payment of relief. £200 of which was paid by Hugh de Plessetis and William Maudat of Hanslope for lands of John de Plessetis, Earl of Warwick⁵³. The other three fines for £100 were made by Robert de Creuker, Stephen de Cressy and Richard Lovel for the lands of their respective fathers⁵⁴. The largest relief fine made during this period was for £1000 which Gilbert de Clare made for the lands of his father, the Earl of Gloucester⁵⁵. The aspects of this particular case will be dealt with later.

⁴⁹*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 197-8; *CLR*, 1260-67, p. 74; C. 60/59, m. 17.

⁵⁰E. 371/27, m. 2; C. 60/60, m. 12.

⁵¹E. 371/27, m. 5; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 249.

⁵²E. 371/27, m. 6.

⁵³E. 371/27, m. 6.

⁵⁴E. 371/27, m. 8, 9, 13. However, Lovel's fine is recorded as having been after the king's handover of power in July 1263.

⁵⁵E. 371/27, m. 12.

The impression gained from the originalia rolls and *Patent Rolls* is that, during the course of the period Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263, the availability of feudal rights to the king was higher than that for the previous six years. However, a sizeable sum of the value of such available rights was not actually translated into cash for the king. For example, the king had granted to John de Balliol that one of John's children could marry an heir whose inheritance was of the value of £500 to £1000 a year. This grant was fulfilled in February 1262 when John was promised the marriage of one of his daughters to Robert, heir of Thomas de Gresle⁵⁶. Also connected with the de Gresle inheritance was the assignment, in March 1262, to John of Brittany, the king's son-in-law, in part payment of 2000m which the king owed him, of the wardship of the lands formerly of the said Thomas⁵⁷. The outstanding dues from Hugh Bigod concerning the wardship of the lands and heirs of William de Kyme were directed towards covering debts of the king. Hugh was ordered, in July 1262, to pay 400m a year to Douai merchants until they had received £1461 18s which the king was bound to them for⁵⁸. Edmund, the king's son, was granted, for his maintenance, the wardship of the lands late of the Earl of Devon and of Thomas de Gresle in January 1263⁵⁹. The following month, Philip Basset, the justiciar, was granted the wardship of the lands late of William de Beauchamp of Bedford, though 200m a year of the issues of the wardship

⁵⁶*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 201-2.

⁵⁷*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 203.

⁵⁸*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 221.

⁵⁹*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 238.

were granted to Ingram de Fenes⁶⁰. Shortly before the events of July 1263, Ebulo de Montibus was granted the wardship of the lands and heirs of Isolda de Lenham⁶¹. In all the above three cases, the grants seem to have been gifts on the king's part since there are no mentions of any fines having been made for these wardships.

It was the handling of the Gloucester inheritance that was to cause serious political problems for Henry. Richard de Clare, the Earl of Gloucester, had died in July 1262. His son and heir, Gilbert, on Richard's death, had crossed over to France for an audience with Henry in order to gain seisin of his father's lands. Gilbert was unable to get his demand fulfilled since the king had instead ordered an enquiry into all the late Earl's lands, rights and liberties for the purpose of recovering crown rights which Henry alleged had been usurped by Richard⁶². The result of Henry's actions was to drive Gilbert into joining up with Simon de Montfort in opposing the king. One of the reasons behind Henry's refusal to grant the Gloucester inheritance to Gilbert straight away, who was not yet nineteen on his father's death, could well have been financial. Richard de Clare's estate was of vast size and the potential value to the king both in terms of income and patronage from the wardship of the estate was huge. A grant issued on the 8th July 1263 by the king to William de Valence highlights this. In part payment of Henry's debts to him, de Valence was granted £500 of issues out of the fruits of the coming

⁶⁰*CPR*, 1258-66, pp. 243, 251-2.

⁶¹*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 267.

⁶²Treharne, *The Baronial Plan*, pp. 284-6; *Close Rolls*, 1261-4, p. 171-2.

autumn of the lands late of Richard de Clare. William was also allowed to have £500 of land for the following year if Gilbert did not '*prove his age*' at the feast of St. Giles⁶³. However this grant to William de Valence was never paid out. The two accounts for the keepers of the Gloucester inheritance cover the period 18 July 1262 to 3 August 1263 and do not record any such sum as having been paid out to William⁶⁴. It was not until Henry's loss of power in July 1263 that Gilbert de Clare made his £1000 fine for the lands of his father⁶⁵, and this would imply that Henry's grant to William de Valence was nullified. It is noticeable here how quickly after Henry's loss of power that Gilbert was able gain seisin of his father's lands which suggests an eagerness on the part of the king's opponents to get him on their side. Thus Henry, by denying Gilbert his inheritance straight away, had driven him into supporting the reformers under de Montfort.

What appears to have happened during Henry's recovery of power, as regards his handling of feudal rights, bears a strong resemblance to the years prior to 1258 in that patronage demands reduced the potential revenue from such rights. As mentioned in the last chapter, Henry, from early 1261, was granting out fees at the exchequer to individuals until they could otherwise be compensated with wardships or escheats, a situation very reminiscent of what he had done between 1255-58. Given the political situation, Henry's handling of patronage in this manner could be expected since there was a need for him to build

⁶³*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 268.

⁶⁴E. 372/111, m. 56d; E. 372/117, m. 15d.

⁶⁵E. 371/27, m. 12.

up support both at court and in the localities. However, it did come at the cost of reducing the amount of cash revenue that the exchequer received from feudal sources.

Determining the exact receipts of the wardrobe during this Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263 period is hampered in that the wardrobe account covering this period is from 26th July 1261 to 31 December 1264, and thus it cannot be worked out exactly what proportion of revenue and expenditure out of the wardrobe was made between Michaelmas 1261 and Michaelmas 1263⁶⁶. The total for receipts for this three and a half year period is £37,264 which might suggest that average annual receipts into the wardrobe were slightly lower than between the years Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261. However, other evidence suggests that a sizeable proportion of this total revenue came into the wardrobe between Michaelmas 1261 and Michaelmas 1262. The £2887 19s 11d received from the vacancy at Winchester presumably came in before Michaelmas 1262 since the account for this vacancy ended in August 1262⁶⁷. The largest contributions to wardrobe receipts were the sums of £7340 10d and £2000 paid to Henry by the French king as part of the peace agreed between the two monarchs. This money was possibly received by Henry around November/December 1261 since the *Patent Rolls* record an acknowledgement on the 10th December 1261 of the receipt of money from the French king in part payment of the cost of knights according to the form of peace agreed between the English and French kings. However, the sum

⁶⁶E. 372/113, m. 3, 4.

⁶⁷E. 372/106, m. 41.

mentioned, £10,416 13s 4d of Tours, does differ from the amount recorded in the wardrobe accounts⁶⁸. These large payments from the French king have been placed in the Michaelmas 1261-62 financial year and this explains why the total for wardrobe receipts not accounted for on the pipe rolls is so large in the revenue tables for the 1261-62 financial year.

For the second half of 1261 and for 1262, Henry seems to have done quite well in terms of financial income, the revenue figures show that crown income for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 increased over the previous year. The large monetary receipts from the French king in particular boosting his income. However, for the subsequent year, that of Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, the king's income appears to have deteriorated, as shown by the pipe roll and receipt roll figures drawn up. Thus, the changes in Henry's income over this two year period mirrors the changes in his political fortunes.

Determining royal expenditure for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263 is very difficult. The only issue roll is for the Easter term of 1263 whilst the *Liberate Rolls* are only complete for the period Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 as the roll for the regnal year October 1262 to October 1263 (47 Henry III)

⁶⁸*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 194. This sum of £10,416 13s 4d of Tours was equivalent to approximately £2600 sterling. However, since I cannot trace other entries in the *Patent Rolls* which provide an exact match with the wardrobe accounts for these receipts from the French king, I have presumed that payment was around the end of 1261.

is greatly damaged with the vast majority of those writs enrolled on it being either *allocate* or *contrabreve* writs. The *liberate* writs that are enrolled on it do not adequately or necessarily show what actual expenditure was taking place. Thus the expenditure totals out of the exchequer for this latter year cannot be determined. Any comments on the financial issues for this year can only be restricted to entries for the Easter term (as contained on the issue roll) and for writs enrolled on the *Liberate Rolls* for the regnal year 46 Henry III (October 1261 to October 1262) which were issued after Michaelmas 1262.

From the only complete roll that remains, the *Liberate Roll* for 46 Henry III (October 1261- October 1262), it appears that authorised expenditure out of the exchequer dropped slightly from the average figures for the years Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261. The significance of this slight fall is not much, but determining whether the subsequent year (Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263) followed a declining trend in authorised expenditure can only be done very indirectly. The income figures produced from the pipe rolls for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263 imply a drop in revenue, whilst the sole receipt roll for this period, that of Easter 1263⁶⁹, records the lowest figure for receipts during any exchequer term of the receipt rolls that survive from Michaelmas 1256 onwards. Given that all this shows a fall in revenue for Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, it would suggest that, with declining receipts, expenditure out of the exchequer for this year would also have declined. In support of this, the Easter 1263 issue roll records a low for issues out of the

⁶⁹E. 401/45A

exchequer for any one term out of the surviving issue rolls of the period of this thesis, a sum of £3110 5s 5d being paid out for this term, this low total for exchequer issues coinciding with the very low total for receipts into the lower exchequer for this same Easter 1263 term⁷⁰. However, whilst a decline in expenditure can be canvassed as having taken place, the extent of any fall cannot be adequately determined.

The table below shows the expenditure figures for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262, as enrolled on the *Liberate Rolls*, and for the expenditure credits enrolled on the two pipe rolls for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263:-

	Liberate Rolls	
	Mich. 1261-62	Mich. 1262-3
Alms	£20	
Wages/Maintenance	£402	
Gift	£296	
Building Works	£213	
Purchases/Munitions	£1442	
Fees	£4073	
Miscellaneous	£3482	
Admin/Expenses	£616	
Wardrobe	£2907	
TOTAL	£13,453	
	Pipe Roll Credits	
Alms	£270	£95

⁷⁰E. 403/19, m. 4

Wages/Maintenance	£1478	£560
Gift	£208	£67
Building Works	£1030	£199
Purchases/Munitions	£1268	£483
Pardon	£486	£416
Fee	£437	£263
Miscellaneous	£1714	£53
Admin/Expenses	£304	£38
TOTAL	£7195	£2174

Fee payments, as usual, were the largest category of outgoings from the exchequer between Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262. The slight fall in the value of writs issued for fees as compared to the previous year reflects the absence of any tribute payments to the papacy out of the exchequer, an outgoing that had totalled 2000m in the previous year. Against this, the return of the Lusignans to England entailed the resumption of fee payments to William de Valence. William received two payments totalling £309 12s 7d in January and May 1262 for the Michaelmas 1261 and Easter 1262 terms of the £500 yearly granted to him, the balance of this sum having been assigned to him in lands⁷¹. The high value of fees granted out for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262, as with the previous year, probably reflects the cost for the king of maintaining support in the localities, following on from the large number of fees he granted out from March 1261 onwards. Again, many of these fees were granted on the proviso that the fees were a temporary measure

⁷¹*CLR*, 1260-67, pp. 73, 95.

until the recipients could receive compensation in the form of wards and escheats falling to the king in the future⁷². Alongside these cases, are examples where an authorised fee to an individual was granted on '*the future terms of his fee*'⁷³. These examples only number six, with the highest grant being for 50m which might suggest that they are not particularly notable; though it might point to the king using current income to provide for dues likely to be presented in the future. Despite his absence from the country, having left after the king's resumption of power, Simon de Montfort, in February 1262, was given a £200 *liberate* writ for the Michaelmas term of 1261 for the dower of his wife⁷⁴.

It is probable that fee payments fell for the year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263. With the lack of *liberate* writ figures for this year one cannot be more definite about this statement. However, credits on the pipe roll for this year that were paid out as fees drops by about 40 per cent from the previous year's roll. Alongside this, the issue roll for Easter 1263 records fee payments totalling £1021⁷⁵. Although this figure is only for one term, when set against the £4073 enrolled on the *Liberate Rolls* for the 1261-62 year, it would suggest that fee payments fell for 1262-3.

Between Michaelmas 1261 and Michaelmas 1262 there is little sign of the king having to borrow money in any

⁷²CPR, 1258-66, pp. 190, 192, 193, 207, 210, 211, 223, 224: CLR, 1260-67, pp. 60, 61, 62, 82, 90, 91.

⁷³CLR, 1260-67, pp. 92, 96.

⁷⁴CLR, 1260-67, p. 77.

⁷⁵E. 403/19.

large scale way. Henry de Gant was commanded to pledge the king's jewels in October 1261 which could suggest a slight cash shortage for the king at that time⁷⁶. However, as mentioned previously, Henry benefited in late 1261 from the receipts of £10,416 13s 4d of Tours from the French king in part payment of the cost of knights as agreed in the peace between the two kings⁷⁷. This money could well have enabled Henry to pay off loans and pledges contracted. For example, in June 1262, Richard de Tilbury, constable of the Tower of London was instructed to allow Henry de Gant to take £600 from the money on deposit there to pay for jewels Henry had pledged in order to make purchases for the wardrobe at the fair of St. Ives⁷⁸. This instruction is probably connected with the above mentioned command to Henry de Gant for pledging jewels in October 1261. Also in June 1262, a 780m payment was authorised out of the exchequer to Florentine merchants for a loan contracted in May 1260⁷⁹. The following month, July 1262, the king assigned to William de Valence 1550m out of the eyre in progress in Essex and out of the next eyre in Hertford in repayment of money that Henry had borrowed out of William's estate during his absence from England⁸⁰. However, the pipe rolls do not record William as receiving any money out of the Essex/ Hertford eyre of this time. The only loan of any size that Henry seems to have been

⁷⁶*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 189.

⁷⁷*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 194.

⁷⁸*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 218.

⁷⁹*CLR*, 1260-67, p. 96.

⁸⁰*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 223.

connected with is one for 1110m which his son, Edward, took out from Florentine merchants which was received in July 1262⁸¹.

This was to be paid at the following quinzaine of Michaelmas out of the 1200m which Edward was to receive from the king's Jewry for the Michaelmas term according to a covenant made between him and the king.

However, for the year Michaelmas 1262 to Michaelmas 1263, the situation starts to change. In October 1262, a *liberate* writ was authorised for 100m for a payment to Florentine merchants for money they had lent to Philip Basset and Walter de Merton, the justiciar and chancellor, and sent by these two men into Wales for the purpose of helping the Earl of Hereford defend the lands of the late Earl of Gloucester⁸². This loan was probably a short term one, possibly reflecting cash flow problems at the exchequer. It is not until the Spring of 1263 that evidence suggests any major financial problems for the king. Several bonds to merchants had earlier in the year postponed the king's payment for purchases and munitions. But in May 1263, steps were taken to cover such dues to merchants. Henry de Gant, keeper of the wardrobe, was ordered to pledge royal jewels for 1000m for purchases of wardrobe necessities from merchants of Lucca made at the fair of St. Ives. This came with the condition that if the said money was not repaid by Michaelmas, it should be levied without reclaim on the said jewels and paid in full to these merchants⁸³. This suggests very onerous terms having been

⁸¹*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 219.

⁸²*CLR*, 1260-67, p. 111.

⁸³*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 257.

placed on Henry in order for him to raise the money he wanted. The wardrobe accounts record that jewels were sold at this time to the value of just over £900⁸⁴, this sum presumably being the outcome of the king's order to Henry de Gant. Also in the same month, Henry assigned £1030 17s 4d of the issues of the eyre in Lincolnshire for the payment of his debts to merchants of Ypres for wardrobe purchases made in past years⁸⁵. However, it is possible that this money was not paid over out of these issues since I have not been able to trace any such credit allowance in the pipe roll accounts for Lincoln for this time. The strongest indication that the king was having financial problems at this time comes from a bond given to the archdeacon of Ely, the treasurer, in May 1263 for 210m to be paid on the quinzaine of Trinity. This loan was contracted by the archdeacon, at the king's instance, from Florentine merchants to pay *liberate* writs ordered by the king, there having been no money in hand in the treasury for this purpose⁸⁶. Other than a loan which Edward, the king's son, contracted from merchants of Cahors on the collateral of the Jewry⁸⁷, the other cases of Henry borrowing money in this period came after the reformers' regaining of power. In September 1263, Henry acknowledged receipt of a loan of 400m from the Bishop of Worcester with a proviso to repay out of the first receipts at the Michaelmas exchequer⁸⁸. The following month a bond was made

⁸⁴E. 372/113, m. 3.

⁸⁵CPR, 1258-66, p. 262.

⁸⁶CPR, 1258-66, p. 258.

⁸⁷CPR, 1258-66, p. 263

⁸⁸CPR, 1258-66, p. 279.

to William de Valence and to Hugh Bigod for £124 6s which Henry received as a loan from them to pay debts and expenses⁸⁹.

Thus the trend in Henry's borrowing appears to reflect the changes in his income for this period. In 1261-62, when his income was fairly strong, there was little need for him to borrow money and instead efforts were made to repay off loans and jewel pledges that the king had made. However, for the subsequent year when the king's income started to collapse, especially around the time of the Easter 1263 exchequer when receipts were at a low, Henry was having to sell jewels and borrow money in order to meet financial commitments that he had made.

The period from Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1263 would appear to see an initial increase followed by a decline in the king's revenue, thus coinciding with the king's political fortunes of this period. During his bid to recover power and to hold on to it during the course of 1262, Henry was comparatively well supplied with money, an important part of his income being provided by the large payments by the French king. This financial well being was reflected in the quite favourable financial position that Henry appeared to have been in during the Michaelmas 1261-62 financial year. Not only was his income for this year relatively high, but he was also able to pay off debts. Significantly, it also provided him with the means to provide a large number of fees and to allow his sheriffs to keep their counties at a lower fixed increment, a policy that would have been important to

⁸⁹*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 283.

Henry as a means of maintaining and encouraging support for his regime.

In contrast, the Michaelmas 1262-63 year shows how weak Henry's finances had become. The uprising in the Marches disrupted the income generated by the counties in that area, whilst the Easter 1263 exchequer produced very low receipts for the king. As a result of this small amount of income, the exchequer ran out of money quickly and was empty by May 1263, thus forcing Henry had to start borrowing. Thus, at the height of the political crisis in July 1263, Henry was chronically short of money.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this involves how important the state of the king's finances were to his political fortunes. When Henry's financial position was relatively strong, he was in the political ascendancy. However, at the time when discontent broke out in the localities and the national political situation became unstable, Henry no longer had the financial resources available to him with which to quell the opposition to his regime.

Chapter 6

The Civil War, 1263-1267

The years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267 encapsulate the period of the civil war and then its immediate aftermath. The political turmoil of these years, with the drift towards and outbreak of civil war in 1263-4, then, after Lewes, Simon de Montfort's ascendancy, and subsequently, following the Battle of Evesham, Henry's recovery of power, meant that policy towards the government's financial administration was subject to changes according to who held control of the government. In the case of de Montfort, any analysis of his tenure of power is limited to stating what changes and reforms he introduced. Since de Montfort's time at the helm of the government was relatively short-lived, the effect of such changes cannot be adequately measured, whilst it is equally impossible to say much that is worthwhile about the level of income generated by his regime. The bulk of the discussion concerning Henry's recovery of control over the country will be dealt with in the next chapter as the years after Michaelmas 1267 give plenty of scope for a thorough analysis of how the administration responded to the events of 1258 to 1267.

Because of the disturbances of this period, the revenue and expenditure tables drawn up are subject to distortions. They have been included in this chapter but comment on changes, from year to year, in the income and expenditure categories will be limited. Instead, following an outline of the political events of these four years, analysis will primarily be based around stating what financial changes happened and why they occurred. This will centre around three sections. The first will discuss procedure at the exchequer for all four years, determining both the changes associated with the hearing of accounts and how far its function as a means of receipt and issue was distorted. The second section will consist of a discussion of the financial situation between Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1265, examining to what extent the civil war diminished the potential revenues to the exchequer. The final section is concerned with the two years after Evesham, being a brief prelude to the major analysis of the king's recovery of power contained in the next chapter.

Henry's acceptance, in July 1263, of the baronial terms of reform whereby *'the ordinances and statutes made at Oxford and the oaths of the king and the magnates and all other persons of the realm of England which had been sworn, should be kept inviolably'*¹. marked, not so much the reformers' recovery of control over the government administration, but rather the beginnings of the civil war. The above declaration was made on the 16th July 1263 and was accompanied with changes to the administrative personnel. Keepers of a number of castles were

¹*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 269.

replaced on the 18th July², whilst, on the following day, Henry's chancellor, Walter of Merton, was replaced and the Great Seal was given to Nicholas, archdeacon of Ely³, Nicholas having held this position previously under the Baronial Council from October 1260 until replaced by the king in 1261. Philip Basset was replaced as Justiciar by Hugh Despenser, another previous council appointment from the years of reform when he had held the justiciarship in 1260-61, Henry, prior of St. Radegund's in Kent became the treasurer, whilst the Council was revived as the final authority in all matters of government (at least in name until the end of September)⁴. A parliament two months later in September secured the assent of those present to the terms of Henry's adherence to the Provisions⁵.

However, despite the reformist victory of July 1263, the tide of events started to turn almost immediately against de Montfort. Edward, the king's son, had not been able to accept Henry's capitulation and, during August, made moves to rebuild his political position. He re-established relationships with his former supporters such as Roger de Leybourne⁶, whose uprising in the Marches had been the catalyst for de Montfort and his allies coming to power. In September, Henry crossed over to Boulogne, along with representatives of the reforming barons, where the

²E. 371/27, m. 11; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 271.

³*CPR*, 1258-66, p. 271.

⁴R. F. Treharne, *The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-63* (Manchester, 1971), pp. 314, 330; J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 232.

⁵Treharne, *Baronial Plan*, p. 321

⁶M. Prestwich, *Edward I* (London 1988), p. 41.

French king had promised to mediate in the disputes between the two sides. This meeting with the French king came to nothing and the participants returned back to England in October⁷. The October parliament held on their return resulted in bitter disputes about compensation and land restitution following the events of the summer where confiscation of estates had taken place during the troubles, whilst agreement could not be reached over Henry's claim to have control over his household. Withdrawing to Windsor, Henry and Edward gathered supporters around themselves from those Marcher lords who had made their peace with Edward to those who had suffered land confiscation at the hands of the rebels but who had been delayed justice by the reforming regime⁸. On November 2nd Henry recovered control of the Great Seal and the Chancery⁹.

The remainder of the year was spent with Henry reasserting his control over the administration. Nicholas of Ely was dismissed as Chancellor with Henry summoning John Chishull to act as his replacement, whilst Roger de la Leye, on 30 November, was appointed to act as treasurer and Chancellor of the Exchequer until further notice¹⁰. Direct conflict between the two sides was only just avoided through the agreement on 13 December to arbitration by the French king over the disputes between the two sides¹¹. The upshot of this arbitration, the result of which was

⁷Treharne, *Baronial Plan*, p. 322.

⁸Ibid., p. 322-4.

⁹Ibid., p. 325.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 330.

¹¹Ibid., p. 333.

declared on 23 January 1264, was that the French king declared strongly for Henry, stating that '*we quash and invalidate all these provisions, ordinances, and obligations, or whatever else they may be called, and whatever has arisen from them or has been occasioned by them*'¹². Henry was to have '*full power and free authority in his kingdom and in all that pertains to it*', i.e. all administrative appointments were subject only to the king's will¹³. The only concession to the reformers was that Henry should pardon them and '*renounce all rancour which he may have against them by reason of these disputes*'¹⁴.

Given the complete repudiation of the position of de Montfort and his allies by the above award, civil war became inevitable and duly broke out in full. The result of this first part of the war was de Montfort's victory at the Battle of Lewes on 14 May 1264. The establishment of peace that followed this victory concentrated power in the hands of three men - Simon de Montfort, the Earl of Gloucester and the Bishop of Chichester - who had the authority to appoint nine councillors, by whose counsel the king was to appoint officials¹⁵. However, de Montfort was not able to impose his authority effectively over royalist supporters following Lewes. This failure on de Montfort's part, especially in his dealings with the Marcher lords, allowed his opponents to continue stalling as regards coming to a settlement with him. An expedition against the Marchers forced them, in December 1264,

¹²*DBM*, p. 287.

¹³*DBM*, p. 289.

¹⁴*DBM*, p. 291.

¹⁵*DBM*, p. 295-7

into agreeing to go into exile for a year in Ireland. However, the Marchers never did sail for Ireland and instead were joined in their opposition to de Montfort by the Earl of Gloucester in the spring of 1265, Gloucester having defected from the baronial cause unhappy with de Montfort's control over the administration. The critical point came when Edward, the king's son, escaped from the custody of the reformers in May 1265. Over the next two months Edward was able to raise a force to combat de Montfort, which culminated in de Montfort's defeat and death at the battle of Evesham on 4 August 1265¹⁶.

Following Evesham, Edward had to set about imposing royal control over the country. A parliament at Winchester in September 1265 decided to disinherit those who had rebelled against the king¹⁷. In early 1266, the citizens of London made a 20,000m fine with the king for a pardon for their behaviour in opposing the crown¹⁸. The year 1266 was spent by Edward trying to quell continued resistance from the adherents of de Montfort¹⁹. However, a rebel garrison in Kenilworth castle held out throughout most of 1266 until December. In October of this year, the Dictum of Kenilworth was promulgated as a way of breaking the siege. By its terms, the king was '*to freely exercise his dominion, authority, and royal power without impediment or contradiction of anyone*' whilst all '*bonds, deeds and instruments*'

¹⁶Prestwich, *Edward I*, pp. 46-51.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 53.

¹⁸E. 371/30, m. 10; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 530-31.

¹⁹Prestwich, *Edward I*, pp. 55-56.

drawn up at the instance of de Montfort were nullified²⁰.

Concessions to the rebels were made to end their opposition. Other than certain types of rebels listed in the Dictum, those rebels who returned to the king's peace within forty days were to be pardoned for their behaviour with no penalty or revenge inflicted against them²¹. The principle behind the conciliation was that the rebels could buy back their confiscated lands on terms which depended on the degree of involvement in the opposition to the crown. These terms varied from paying a ransom of one half of the value of their goods to seven times the value of land²².

However, problems remained for Edward, as regards quelling disquiet in the country, well into 1267. In April 1267, the Earl of Gloucester lent his support to the cause of the disinherited rebels as a result of his grievances concerning gaining control of dower lands held by his mother, his disputes with Roger de Mortimer over control of the Marcher estates of the younger Humphrey de Bohun, and his receipt of very little in the way of royal grants for his services to the crown²³. In this month, Gloucester marched on London, joining forces with John d'Eyville and a popular rising in their support occurred in the city. However, by mid June a settlement was reached and Gloucester left London, pledging himself not to engage in further hostilities. Following this, Edward was able to overcome the remaining rebels holding out in the Isle

²⁰*DBM*, p. 321, 323.

²¹*DBM*, p. 321.

²²*DBM*, p. 325-335.

²³Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 58.

of Ely and by Autumn 1267 peace was finally achieved in England²⁴.

As can be expected, the civil war and the immediate aftermath caused change and disruption to the workings of the exchequer with the audits of certain shrieval accounts being delayed for several years, with reduced shrieval attendance at the lower exchequer occurring and with sheriffs having the terms on which they rendered account being changed. However, throughout this period the exchequer continued its administrative duties without breaking down completely, though its effectiveness as a means for the receipt of revenues was much diminished.

As stated previously, Henry handed over power to the reformers under Simon de Montfort in July 1263, but was able to regain control of the Great Seal by November 1263. It was not until after the Battle of Lewes in May 1264 that de Montfort was able to re-establish himself at the head of the administration. Thus, it was only for a couple of months in the Summer and early Autumn of 1263 that the reformers had control over the key offices of state. Changes in the shrieval office during this time were minimal. Hamo Lestrage was the only sheriff appointed during this time, with Salop/ Staffordshire being committed to his keeping²⁵. From the time of Henry's recovery of the seal in November 1263 to his defeat at Lewes there were a few changes in the shrieval office, the originalia rolls for October 1263 to

²⁴Ibid., p. 58-9.

²⁵E. 371/27, m. 11; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 274.

October 1264 recording nine such changes²⁶. After Lewes, in June 1264, there was then a widespread change of sheriffs with eighteen new shrieval office holders being installed on the terms of rendering '*ut custos*'²⁷. Most of these men continued in office, or rather rendering account for their shire issues, until Michaelmas 1265. Following the royalist victory at Evesham, there was again a widespread change of personnel in the shires. This was carried out between August and November 1265 with Henry appointing his supporters into the sheriffs' offices²⁸.

The notable point about the de Montfort appointments to the shrieval office is that, as mentioned above, they were to hold their positions as custodial sheriffs answering for variable profits above the basic county farm. Appointing sheriffs on these conditions abided by the Provisions of Oxford and its terms, the reforms around which de Montfort had made one of the central tenets of his political position. However, it is possible that de Montfort and the reformers around him made this administrative change for political reasons. Lacking support from the major magnates, de Montfort could well have hoped that by introducing this reform he could attract support from the knightly class, whose wishes had been considered when custodial sheriffs were introduced in Michaelmas 1258. From an administrative point of view, given the small figure for variable profits raised between Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259, the re-introduction of this scheme was not likely to be financially beneficial but rather the

²⁶E. 371/28, m. 1, 3.

²⁷E. 371/28, m. 3.

²⁸E. 371/29, m. 9; E. 371/30, m. 10.

opposite. Certainly, as can be seen from the table below, the total for variable profit generated above the farm was smaller than that for the years where fixed increments were the dominant means of accounting for shire issues above the farm.

Financial Year	Dominant Accounting Procedure	Liable	Profit/Increment
Mich 1263-64	Profit/Increment	£831 4s 11. 5d	
Mich 1264-65	Variable Profit	£600 6s 8. 5d	
Mich 1265-66	Fixed Increment	£1597 15s 9d	
Mich 1267-67	Fixed Increment	£1378 18s 1. 5d	

These figures are based on the variable profits and fixed increment sums enrolled on the pipe rolls as being the liable dues from sheriffs for their periods in office during these four years. The Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1264 figure shows a large fall from the previous year when liable fixed increments and variable profits had totalled £1718 6s 5d²⁹. This low figure and that for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 obviously reflect the effects of the civil war, which was bound to reduce the amount of income that sheriffs could raise. From Michaelmas 1265, sheriffs rendering fixed increments for their counties became the standard accounting procedure though Henry did continue to appoint a few custodial sheriffs.

In fact, throughout these four years, there was a fluctuating use of custodial sheriffs. In the years either side of de Montfort's ascendancy, when Henry was in control of the

²⁹See previous chapter.

administration, such accounting procedures for sheriffs were also used. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Henry had appointed four custodial sheriffs prior to handing power over in July 1263. Following his recovery of the Seal and control of the major administrative offices in November 1263, he appointed eight sheriffs before Lewes on terms that suggest custodial tenures of office. In all eight cases, the appointments, as recorded on the originalia rolls, state that the sheriffs concerned were to render account for the issues of their counties at the exchequer. A ninth appointment, or rather re-appointment, of Eustace de Balliol as sheriff of Cumberland, was on fixed increment terms³⁰.

Of these eight sheriffs, two of them, Adam de Greyvill (Northamptonshire) and John de Grey (Nottingham/ Derby) were appointed in April 1264³¹, just before Lewes, and hence did not account at the exchequer, their respective counties having new sheriffs appointed after Lewes by de Montfort's regime. A further two of the eight sheriffs, William Bagod and William de Grey, have entries for April 1264 commanding them to answer for the issues of their counties³². These two sheriffs had both already been holding their offices - William Bagod had been rendering '*ut custos*' for Warwick/ Leicester since Michaelmas 1262, whilst William de Grey had been holding Lincolnshire since Michaelmas 1261, rendering for a fixed increment at the exchequer. Both were replaced after Lewes, and thus there is no mention on the pipe rolls of the change in terms on which William de Grey held office.

³⁰E. 371/28, m. 1.

³¹E. 371/28, m. 3; C. 60/61, m. 4.

³²E. 371/28, m. 3; C. 60/61, m. 4.

The other four of these eight sheriffs - Henry of Almain, Roger de Leybourne, Robert de Nevill and Roger de Clifford - had been appointed or confirmed in office earlier in November and December 1263³³. Two of these sheriffs, Roger de Clifford for Gloucestershire and Robert de Neville for Yorkshire, had been holding their shrieval offices '*ut custos*' since the summer of 1263. The other two sheriffs appointed at this time, Henry of Almain to Somerset/ Dorset and Roger de Leybourne to Kent, do not have any entries on their pipe roll accounts suggesting that they were rendering '*ut custos*'. Equally there is no mention of either of them being liable for a fixed increment. These two cases point towards a discrepancy between the terms for shrieval office holders as recorded on the originalia rolls and the terms on which sheriffs actually answered for at the exchequer as suggested by the pipe rolls. This problem will be dealt with subsequently as it is more pronounced in the years after Evesham. An aside here concerning these four appointments in late 1263 is that all four were major magnates. Their insertion into shrieval offices possibly suggests the need for the king to install 'strong' men into the counties in order to maintain a power base in the localities as civil war became a reality. Three of the men - Henry of Almain, Roger de Leybourne and Roger de Clifford - had only firmly attached themselves to the royalist cause during the course of the autumn of 1263³⁴, and their appointments as sheriffs could hence reflect not only this need to insert 'strong men' into the

³³E. 371/28, m. 1.

³⁴Treharne, *Baronial Plan*, p. 323.

localities but also a reward by Henry for their change of allegiance.

As stated, it was during de Montfort's time at the helm of the administration that there was a widespread use of custodial sheriffs. The originalia rolls, for June 1264, record eighteen sheriffs being appointed with the command to render the issues of their counties at the exchequer (though, on the pipe rolls, only seventeen counties can be clearly determined as having sheriffs rendering '*ut custos*' for part or all of the period June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265)³⁵. Of the remaining seven counties, where there is no reference to a sheriff rendering '*ut custos*' on the pipe rolls, it can be determined in one case that the sheriff for June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 was actually responsible for variable profits. This county was Buckinghamshire/ Bedfordshire, whose sheriff, Simon de Pateshull, rendered a sum of £82 9s 9.5d for his tenure of office on the Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 pipe roll³⁶. Two of the counties, London/ Middlesex and Worcestershire, were traditionally not liable for an increment above the farm, whilst another two, Oxfordshire/ Berkshire and Cumberland, rendered for fixed increments. In the case of Cumberland, the sheriff throughout this period, Eustace de Baillol, had been appointed by Henry, holding office since July 1261³⁷. The Oxfordshire/ Berkshire sheriff, John de St Valery, had been appointed in June 1264 and there is nothing in the terms of his

³⁵E. 371/28, m. 3.

³⁶E. 372/114, m. 1.

³⁷CPR, 1258-66, p. 164. However, on the pipe rolls Eustace did not start accounting for Cumberland until Michaelmas 1261.

appointment to suggest that he was to render for a fixed increment. The other two counties with no reference to the terms of office being '*ut custos*' are Lancashire and Salop/ Staffordshire, though, for Lancashire, there are no accounts in Henry's reign for the years after Michaelmas 1262. Both these counties were listed as having new sheriffs appointed in June 1264 and so presumably there must have been an intention at that time for the sheriffs concerned, Robert de Lathum for Lancashire and Robert de Grendon for Salop/ Staffordshire, to act as custodians.

Aside from the Oxfordshire/ Berkshire and Cumberland sheriffs who, as stated above, rendered for fixed increments, nine sheriffs were able to derive variable profits from their county issues between June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265. However, the success of these sheriffs in doing so was variable. There are two cases of sheriffs raising higher variable profits (in terms of average revenue raised per quarter) than the fixed increments in force up to Lewes. However, these two sheriffs, John de Bottele for Hampshire and Eustace de Watford for Northamptonshire, only very slightly increased the financial returns from variable profits over the previous fixed increments for their counties. In addition, there are a further three counties whose sheriffs, during the de Montfort regime, appear to have raised higher variable profits than their predecessors in office had. The Warwick/ Leicester sheriff, Richard de Harington, was able to generate variable profits whereas the sheriff in office before him, William Bagod, who had rendered '*ut custos*' from Michaelmas 1262 to June 1264, did not raise any such profit during his shrieval tenure. William, son of Herbert, the

Nottingham/ Derby sheriff, raised £119 15s 6d during his term³⁸. This contrasts with the previous sheriff, John de Baillol, who, between his appointment as sheriff in July 1261 until his removal from office in June 1264, had no fixed increment assigned to him on the pipe rolls. The third of these counties was Gloucestershire whose sheriff, Reynold de Acle, for most of the year Michaelmas 1264-65 rendered a higher profit figure than the previous two sheriffs did³⁹. However, the accounts for this county are disjointed between the summer of 1263 to Michaelmas 1265 and therefore Reynold's higher profit figure is misleading. It is much smaller than the fixed increment for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262, the last year in which a clear figure is given for the Gloucestershire fixed increment. The four remaining counties of the nine - Northumberland, Wiltshire, Surrey/ Sussex and Buckinghamshire/ Bedfordshire - all rendered lower variable profit figures than the fixed increments previously in force.

That only a minority of the shires were able to generate some form of revenue above the farm is not surprising given the civil war in progress. However, there is one notable point raised by these figures. This concerns Simon de Montfort and the counties of Warwick and Leicester. As can be seen above, the sheriff of Warwick/ Leicester was one of the few shrieval office holders to produce variable profits above the county farm for de Montfort's tenure in office that were higher than the fixed increments in force previously. Similarly, during the previous large scale use of variable profits in Michaelmas 1258-59, the

³⁸E. 372/110, m. 23.

³⁹E. 372/109, m.21.

Warwick/ Leicester sheriff had been only one of two sheriffs that had generated higher variable profits than the fixed increments in force in the previous year (1257-58). This implies that de Montfort's political position heavily influenced the receipts that the sheriff could receive, an occurrence that would have reflected his personal power in these two counties; many of his followers held their lands in the vicinity of Kenilworth and Leicester whilst he had strong connections and influence throughout the Midlands⁴⁰. Taking into account the evidence concerning the previous sheriff not being able to raise any money at all from Warwick/ Leicester between Michaelmas 1262 to Easter 1264, a period when de Montfort was opposing the king and his government, it appears fairly conclusive that the receipts generated above the farm in these two counties were dependent on de Montfort's political stance.

With de Montfort's defeat at Evesham in August 1265, control of shrieval appointments passed back to the king. It is not totally clear what initial policy was intended as regards the terms on which the sheriffs were to hold office. Those shrieval appointments made between August and October 1265 on the originalia roll for 49 Henry III (October 1264 to October 1265) contain terms, in the majority of cases, commensurate with those for the eight sheriffs, as mentioned previously, that Henry appointed between November 1263 and the Battle of Lewes. Fourteen sheriffs were appointed in the three months after Evesham according to this roll. Of these fourteen, eleven were

⁴⁰D. A. Carpenter, 'Simon de Montfort: The First Leader of a Political Movement in English History', *History*, lxxvi (1991), pp. 10-13.

appointed on terms that suggest a custodial appointment (there being no mention of a fixed increment or reference to anything suggesting as much)⁴¹, these terms being *'ita quod de exitibus inde provenientibus Regis responsalis ad scaccarium Regis'*⁴². However, on the originalia roll for October 1265 to October 1266, a membrane dated the 18th October 1265 lists 22 holders of the shrieval office for which 19 entries have a fixed increment assigned to the sheriff to render for his county⁴³. A further county, Cumberland, had its sheriff, Eustace Baillol, rendering on the same terms as a previous sheriff, William de Dacre, had answered for. But elsewhere on the roll Eustace was replaced as Cumberland sheriff by Roger de Leybourne on the 20th November 1265 on terms of *'ita quod de exitibus....'*⁴⁴. Of the above 19 entries, the appointment to Northamptonshire, Richard de Tyndal was cancelled and instead Warin de Bassingbourne was appointed. The terms of Warin's appointment are not mentioned but on the pipe rolls he rendered *'ut custos'* for his shrieval tenure from Michaelmas 1265⁴⁵. The two appointments of the 22 that do not mention terms are those for Roger de Leybourne to Kent and William de Grey to Lincoln. From information contained on the pipe rolls, it is apparent that Roger rendered for a fixed increment

⁴¹E. 371/29, m. 9.

⁴²'So which, in the proceeds of the king, he is answerable for the issues at the king's exchequer'.

⁴³E. 371/30, mm. 13, 13d.

⁴⁴E. 371/30, m. 10. However, in the pipe rolls, Roger answered for a £40 fixed increment (E. 372/111, m. 5d).

⁴⁵E. 372/110, m.5.

whilst William rendered his account on custodial terms⁴⁶. Therefore, it seems that by the 18th October 1265 a general policy of sheriffs rendering for fixed increments had been decided upon. Certainly, the pipe roll shire accounts for Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267 show this to be the case. Only two counties, Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire, had their sheriffs accounting for variable profits throughout these two years. A third county, Norfolk/ Suffolk, had its sheriff changed in August 1266 and the new sheriff, Roger de Colevill, rendered for variable profits through to Michaelmas 1267⁴⁷.

The discrepancy between the terms on which sheriffs were appointed in the months after Evesham and those that were in force after October 1265 can probably be explained by the disruption to the administrative and financial state of the realm caused by the civil war. In the immediate aftermath of Evesham, the priority of the royalist victors would have been to re-establish their political control over the country. This implies that sheriffs appointed on the terms '*ita quod de exitibus....*' reflects not a policy and use of custodial sheriffs, but rather the need for the royalists to establish their men into the shires with a general command to try and raise as much income from their shires as possible. Only with a firm government established, could administrative concerns turn to a detailed examination and determination of the terms and fixed increments to be applied to individual sheriffs. Given that, as mentioned above, a membrane from the originalia rolls for 18th October 1265 contains a list of so

⁴⁶E. 372/110, m.11; E. 372/111, m.21.

⁴⁷E. 371/30, m. 7.

many shrieval appointments and the levels of fixed increments that they were to render, it would suggest that this was the case, i.e. the membrane records the outcome of exchequer discussions about the terms of shrieval accounting to be used.

Returning back to the four sheriffs appointed by Henry in November and December 1263 on terms of rendering '*ita quod de exitibus...*', their accounting terms should be seen not so much as a use of custodial sheriffs by Henry before Lewes but as a use of powerful supporters with the strength to impose royal control over their shires. None of these four - Henry of Almain, Roger de Leybourne, Robert de Nevill and Roger de Clifford - raised any variable profit (or rather any money) above the levels of their basic county farms. Thus, their appointments seem to be reminiscent of the use of curial sheriffs of earlier in the century, whereby financial gain was sacrificed for an increased royal influence in the shires⁴⁸. Therefore, in conclusion, it appears that the only time where a concerted policy of custodial sheriffs was followed was during de Montfort's tenure of power between the battles of Lewes and Evesham. The sheriffs appointed by Henry prior to Lewes on non-fixed increment terms reflects a use of curial sheriffs with political, not financial, reasons dictating their appointments.

With the re-introduction of custodial sheriffs and the Provisions of Oxford, the payment of sheriffs had to be addressed.

⁴⁸D. A. Carpenter, 'The decline of the curial sheriff in England 1194-1258', *EHR*, xci (1976), p. 3-4. Discusses the reasons behind the appointments of curial sheriffs in the localities.

As with the custodial sheriffs in office between Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259, only a small minority of sheriffs rendering '*ut custos*' in the years after 1263 seemed to have received an allowance for their shrieval tenure. Again, this begs the question whether there was any firm intention on the part of the exchequer to give out such credits to sheriffs for the keeping of their offices. However, in contrast to the previous widespread use of custodial sheriffs, the continually fluctuating political climate after the summer of 1263 greatly hindered the efficient functioning of the exchequer. Those custodial sheriffs appointed by de Montfort's regime after Lewes had the bulk of their accounts audited after Michaelmas 1265, by which time de Montfort was dead and the king had control of the central administration. Thus, any granting of allowances was at the whim of the king's administration.

There are only eleven clear examples of a salary allowance being credited to a sheriff for his custodial term of office during the period from the summer of 1263 to Michaelmas 1267. The first sheriff to apply for and then receive such an allowance was John de Bottele, who accounted as a custodial sheriff for Hampshire from June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265. He was credited a sum of 31m 40d for this period in office on the Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 pipe roll⁴⁹. The evidence surrounding the granting of this allowance highlights the disorganised state of the exchequer at this time. John's account for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 was heard at the exchequer three weeks after Michaelmas 1265 and the memoranda roll

⁴⁹E. 372/110, m.9d.

entry recording this audit also states that John put in a claim for expenses⁵⁰. This was not enrolled on the pipe roll for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265, instead it was not credited to John until the subsequent pipe roll, Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266. In addition, the *Liberate Rolls* for the end of 1267 (28th December) record an entry '*Allocate to John de Botele, sheriff and improver of Hampshire, as much as was wont to be allowed to his predecessors*'⁵¹. This writ granting John an allowance was issued after his allowance had been enrolled on the pipe rolls.

The Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 pipe roll records three other allowances granted out. William, son of Herbert, custodial sheriff for Nottinghamshire/ Derbyshire from June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265, had his account for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 recorded on this roll. In this audit he was granted 40m for his expenses for this time and also £7 15s 1d from the profit of the county⁵². In contrast to John de Bottele, the memoranda roll account concerning this audit makes no reference to William claiming any expenses⁵³. The second of these further allowances granted out on this pipe roll was to Eustace de Watford, the custodial sheriff for Northamptonshire from June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265. He was given 50m for his custody of the county for this time along with another 40m allowance which was credited to him for his tenure as sheriff of the same county

⁵⁰E. 368/40, m. 14d.

⁵¹*CLR*, 1267-72, p. 8.

⁵²E. 372/110, m.23.

⁵³E. 368/41, m. 10d.

between Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259⁵⁴. This latter allowance was probably given to him at this time since his arrears for this previous tenure in office were finally accounted for on this Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 pipe roll. Again, as with William, son of Herbert, there is no expenses claim or mention of expenses on the memoranda roll that covers the period of this pipe roll for Eustace⁵⁵. The other case from this pipe roll concerns Fulk Peyforer, Kent sheriff under the de Montfort regime. *Allocate* writs from August 1266 allowed Fulk to keep the surplus of the corpus of Kent and to claim his reasonable expenses for the keeping of the county, Milton manor and hundred, and the castles of Rochester and Canterbury from St. John Baptist 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 and also from his tenure between Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259⁵⁶. These writs were reflected on the Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 pipe roll on which, in the Kent county accounts, Fulk was not summoned to pay the outstanding debts from his term in office. These allowances reflecting Fulk's inability to cover the basic county farm and raise any variable profits. He was let off £88 16s 1d for his tenure between Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 and £152 2s 5d for his second tenure in office under de Montfort. Fulk was then subsequently granted £40 and £37 10s allowances for his keeping of Kent and the castles for the two respective tenures with

⁵⁴E. 372/110, m.5.

⁵⁵E. 368/41, m13-13d.

⁵⁶CLR, 1260-67, p. 227-8.

additional allowances of £10 and £12 10s for his keeping of Milton manor⁵⁷.

Warin de Bassingburn, the Northamptonshire custodial sheriff from Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267, received an allowance for the two year period that he was in office once his final yearly account was audited at the exchequer. He was recorded as having been allowed 80m for his custody of the county for this time on the Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll⁵⁸. Also, on the same pipe roll, Roger de Coleville received a 100m allowance for his keeping of Norfolk/ Suffolk and Norwich castle for the last quarter of the year Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 and for all of the following year up to Michaelmas 1267, having held the county on custodial terms during this period⁵⁹.

There were four other allowances enrolled on the pipe rolls of Henry's reign. On the Michaelmas 1267 to 1268 pipe roll, Ralph de Aungers was allowed £18 15s for his custody of Wiltshire from June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265⁶⁰. This sum granted to Ralph differs from a proposed salary allowance granted to him (or rather to his under sheriff John de Aungers) on the Michaelmas 1265 to Trinity 1266 memoranda roll. This entry stated that John's outstanding debt of £20 15s was to be allocated to him for his expenses in the keeping of the county⁶¹.

⁵⁷E. 372/110, m. 9.

⁵⁸E. 372/111, m. 4.

⁵⁹E. 372/111, m.35d.

⁶⁰E. 372/112, m. 33d.

⁶¹E. 368/40, m. 20.

Two allowances were then subsequently enrolled on the Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 pipe roll. Richard de Harington received 50m for his custodial tenure of Warwick/ Leicester⁶². The other allowance was for Simon de Pateshull, the Buckinghamshire/ Bedfordshire sheriff from June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265. His two accounts covering this period on the Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1264 and the Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 pipe rolls do not state that he was rendering '*ut custos*' or record any liable profit to be accounted for. The first mention of an allowance to be granted to him comes in the *Liberate Rolls*, on the 20th April 1271, where it states that he was to be given the '*customary allowance*'⁶³. Then, on the Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 pipe roll, in which he accounted for the variable profit raised between June 1264 and Michaelmas 1265, he was given 70m for his custody of this county for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1259 and for June 1264 to Easter 1265⁶⁴. Why he received no allowance for Easter 1265 to Michaelmas 1265 cannot be explained. It is possible that he might have changed to rendering at farm for this latter period though there is no evidence either on the pipe or originalia rolls to suggest that this was the case. The other case of an allowance being granted and recorded on the pipe rolls of Henry's reign is the 40m granted to Edmund le Espigornel for his father's, Nicholas's, custodial tenure of Essex/ Hertford between Michaelmas 1264-65⁶⁵.

⁶²E. 372/114, m. 11.

⁶³CLR, 1267-72, p. 168.

⁶⁴E. 372/114, m. 1.

⁶⁵E. 372/115, m.13d.

The final clear example of an allowance being granted out was to John de Abernun. This was not recorded on the pipe rolls until the second such roll of Edward I's reign when John was allowed £30 for his custody of Surrey/ Sussex for the period Easter 1264 to Michaelmas 1265⁶⁶. However, the evidence clearly suggests that there was an intention to grant John an allowance much earlier. The Michaelmas 1267 to Trinity 1268 memoranda roll, which gives the dates of John's audit at the exchequer for his time as sheriff, records that John was to be given £30 for his expenses for the custody of Surrey/ Sussex and Guildford castle for this period⁶⁷. This was followed by an *allocate* writ, dated 19th November 1268, allowing John this £30 for his tenure as a custodial sheriff⁶⁸.

Although the above mentioned eleven sheriffs can clearly be determined as having received allowances, there is evidence that points to other sheriffs possibly receiving or initially having been granted an allowance. There are four entries on the memoranda rolls which suggest that certain sheriffs sought or were being granted an allowance. Three of these, those concerned with John de Bottele, John de Aungers John de Abernun, have already been mentioned. The memoranda roll for Michaelmas 1267 to Trinity 1268 suggests a possible sum having been granted to William de Bozzehale, the custodial sheriff for Yorkshire from June 1264 to Michaelmas 1265. At the end of the Yorkshire county entry on this roll, William is stated as owing £34

⁶⁶E. 372/118, m 28d.

⁶⁷E. 368/42, m. 25d.

⁶⁸CLR, 1267-72, p. 56.

6s 1. 5d for which *'share is allocated to him for his expenses'*⁶⁹. However, his account for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265, audited on the Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll, makes no mention of any custodial allowance to him. It could be that instead his allowance was a 'silent' one in that the exchequer did not demand payment of his outstanding account arrears.

There is one other case of a sheriff being compensated for his time in office, and that is connected with Roger de Leybourne. The Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 pipe roll records Roger as having been allowed £100 for his custody of Kent during the course of the year Michaelmas 1263-64⁷⁰. However, Roger was sheriff for only the first half of this year, i.e. Michaelmas 1263 to Easter 1264, and, according to the pipe rolls, did not serve as a custodial sheriff⁷¹. He was appointed to the Kent shrieval office by the king in December 1263⁷², and thus this allowance to him could well reflect a monetary credit to him by the king in return for his efforts and expenses during the civil war. This is probably the case since Roger's appointment came shortly after he had made his peace with the king following the uprising he had sparked off earlier in the year, whilst the allowance credit to him for his time in office came after the king's recovery of power at Evesham.

From the above, it can be seen that the granting of allowances was by no means comprehensive. Determining why

⁶⁹E. 368/42, m. 19.

⁷⁰E. 372/110, m.11.

⁷¹But note the previous comments about this appointment.

⁷²E. 371/28, m. 1.

certain sheriffs received allowances and others did not is not easy. However, it is noticeable that of the eleven clear examples listed of sheriffs receiving a custodial allowance on the pipe rolls, only Fulk Peyforer was unable to raise a variable profit above the basic county farm. This common factor does not apply to the other possible cases of an allowance being granted. William de Bozzehale did not raise a variable profit, whilst Roger de Leybourne was not liable for any issues above the county farm. Of the other counties where a sheriff rendered '*ut custos*' during the de Montfort regime, only Northumberland's sheriff, Robert de Insula, raised a variable profit above the farm (though Cumberland did have a fixed increment above the farm during this period). Thus, there is an implication here that the receipt of allowances was dependent upon whether the sheriff had raised a sum above the basic county farm. However, it is debatable whether the exchequer had any such policy towards the payment of such salaries to custodial sheriffs given that in the years after Michaelmas 1265, as mentioned in a previous chapter, allowances were granted out to certain of the Michaelmas 1258-Michaelmas 1259 custodial sheriffs in a manner that was not commensurate with the variable profit returns from this earlier period. It should perhaps be pointed out that those allowances granted out for both periods of widespread use of custodial sheriffs came in the years after Michaelmas 1265, possibly signifying that the exchequer was trying to sort out outstanding salary claims.

With the four years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267 being marked throughout by an unstable political situation, the revenue figures drawn up are only very approximate and

liable to distortions with the totals for the two years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1265, in particular, probably overestimating the amount of money being paid into the exchequer. These distortions stem from the infrequent auditing of shire accounts during this time. Only three counties - Hampshire, Essex/ Hertfordshire and London/ Middlesex - had their yearly shire accounts audited on each of the pipe rolls encompassing Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267. The remaining counties all had periods of at least two years and, in many cases, up to four years or more where there sheriffs did not turn up at the exchequer of audit. M. H. Mills lists twelve cases of accounts heard on the three pipe rolls for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1267 where the shire account audit in each case was for a period of three years or longer⁷³. In addition, there are two counties with missing shire accounts for all or part of this period. Lancashire's account audits are non-existent for all four years - there being no account for this county at all for the years of Henry's reign after Michaelmas 1262. Throughout this time, until Michaelmas 1266, the various Lancashire sheriffs, or their representatives, appeared at the exchequer for the *Adventus* proffers. It is possible that the disappearances of Lancaster from the pipe rolls might be connected with the king's grant of the county and his demesne lands within it to his son Edmund in 1267⁷⁴. This would have resulted in there being no need for an audit of Lancashire to be included on the pipe rolls as issues from the county no longer belonged to the king. Certainly from Michaelmas 1267 onwards,

⁷³M. H. Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", 1258-72', *EHR*, xxxvi (1921), p. 487.

⁷⁴*CChR*, 1257-1300, p. 78.

the *Adventus* either does not record any entry for Lancashire or, when Lancashire is mentioned, it does not state any attendance at the exchequer by a sheriff or a representative. The other county with a missing account is Worcester for Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1268. However, the Michaelmas 1268 to Trinity 1269 memoranda roll states that an audit for Worcester for these years was heard at the exchequer on the 1st April 1269⁷⁵, which suggests that the account should be on the Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 pipe roll. Since it is not on this roll, it can only be assumed that for some reason the audit was not attached to this roll.

The table below lists the yearly totals for attendance at the exchequer of audit, as recorded by both the memoranda rolls and by the number of audits contained on the pipe rolls:-

Financial Year	Number of Audits on the Pipe Rolls	Number of Audits on Memoranda Rolls ⁷⁶
Mich. 1262-1263	9	9
Mich. 1263-1264	11	9
Mich. 1264-1265	8	8
Mich. 1265-1266	9	8
Mich. 1266-1267	14	11

The figures in the column listing the number of audits on the pipe roll are similar in four of the years to those figures M. H. Mills records for shrieval attendance at the exchequer of audit

⁷⁵E. 368/43, m. 23d.

⁷⁶Taken from the *Compoti Comitatum* section of the memoranda rolls.

for this period. The exception is for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 where she records only seven sheriffs having their accounts audited⁷⁷. The relevant memoranda roll in each case is for the Michaelmas to Trinity period after the dates of the pipe roll, i.e. the Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 pipe roll was drawn up after Michaelmas 1265 and entries recording dates of shrieval attendance for audit are recorded on the Michaelmas 1265 to Trinity 1266 memoranda roll. As can be seen from the table, there is a discrepancy for three of the years between the number of audits recorded and dated on the memoranda rolls and the number of shire accounts recorded on the pipe rolls. Taking the Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll as an example, three counties - Cumberland, Cambridge/ Huntingdonshire and Salop/ Staffordshire - have accounts recorded on this roll but the Michaelmas 1267 to Trinity 1268 memoranda roll, which records the dates of the audits for the accounts on this Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll, makes no mention of any audit dates for these three shires. In the case of Cambridge/ Huntingdon, the next county account recorded for it in the memoranda rolls is for the year Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 in the Michaelmas 1268 to Trinity 1269 memoranda roll which makes no mention of any account for Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 being heard at the same time⁷⁸. Similarly, on the Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1264 pipe roll, the Yorkshire and Devon accounts for that year are listed and yet the Michaelmas 1264 to Trinity 1265 memoranda roll makes no

⁷⁷M. H. Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", p. 488.

⁷⁸E. 368/43, m. 23.

mention in the county account section of these audits. Again, when the county account audits are next listed in the memoranda rolls for these two shires, no reference is made to the Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1264 audit in both cases⁷⁹. It seems likely that these discrepancies reflect administrative problems in the functioning of the exchequer, i.e. since pipe roll shire audits were going unmentioned on the memoranda rolls, it could suggest that the exchequer was not functioning smoothly.

In these circumstances, estimating the amount of receipts that were paid into the exchequer in any particular year is impossible. The methodology used in the compilation of the adjusted revenue tables, by which the total sum in each category of revenue is divided by the number of years covered by an account and attributing the resultant figures to the respective financial years, is thus subject to distortions. Therefore, any conclusions about revenue passing through the exchequer have to be treated very carefully. Achieving any realistic idea of what the cash flow into the exchequer was during this period is further hampered since no receipt rolls survive for these years. Thus, one has to rely on the *Adventus Vicecomitum* for evidence of what the yearly cash flow, via the Easter and Michaelmas proffers, was for these four years, and even then, as has been discussed in previous chapters, the *Adventus* figures give little indication of total revenue.

As can be expected, shrieval attendance at the exchequer for the paying of the Easter and Michaelmas proffers varied over the years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267 with

⁷⁹E. 368/42, m. 18 for York; E. 368/43, m. 26 for Devon.

the period of civil war particularly affecting such attendance. The table below shows the number of sheriffs, or their deputies, attending the proffers during this period with the total sum of the proffer receipts for each term:

Term	Numbers Attending	Numbers Paying Money	Proffer Totals
Mich. 1263	23	19	£746 13s 4d
Easter 1264	No Proffer		
Mich. 1264	16	6	£125 15s
Easter 1265	23	18	£960 13s ⁸⁰
Mich. 1265	8	1	£50 ⁸¹
Easter 1266	14 ⁸²	10	£326 10s
Mich. 1266	21	4	£54
Easter 1267	No Proffer		
Mich. 1267	21	13	£353

Comparing these proffer totals with the years prior to the civil war shows, as can be expected, that the *Adventus Vicecomitum* produced substantially lower receipts into the

⁸⁰There is a figure of £80 attributed to the Northumberland sheriff's representative for his proffer. However, since it is underlined, I have assumed that it was not actually paid, and, therefore, it has been excluded from the total for this term (E. 368/39, m. 24d).

⁸¹The Northumberland sheriff's representative, who paid this sum, did so, not at Michaelmas, but on the 17th October 1265 (E. 368/40, m. 24).

⁸²There are two different entries for London and for Middlesex on the *Adventus*. For this table, I have counted them as one.

exchequer. These low figures, along with the failure to hold two proffers help to demonstrate the disruption to the exchequer, and royal finances in general, caused by the civil war and its aftermath. The two terms when proffers were not held, Easter 1264 and Easter 1267, occurred at times of particular disturbance. The former case resulting from both the royalist and reforming armies being engaged on campaigns which culminated in the Battle of Lewes, the latter case reflecting the Earl of Gloucester's uprising, his march on London and the resultant uprising in the city.

The proffer totals that have been stated above, equate, on a yearly basis, to the sums listed in the table below:-

Calendar Year	Easter and Michaelmas Proffer Totals
1264	£125 15s
1265	£1010 13s
1266	£380 10s
1267	£353

The figures above vary, in the cases of three years, from the equivalent proffer totals for this period that M. H. Mills and E. F. Jacob quote⁸³. It is only for the Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 year that both sets of figures match. The difference for Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1264 is due to a discrepancy over the proffer at Michaelmas 1264 by the

⁸³M. H. Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", p. 494; E. F. Jacob, *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67*, (Oxford 1925), pp. 248-9.

Cambridge/ Huntingdon sheriff's representative. Jacob records £40 as having been paid in, whilst a figure of 40m has been included in the above table⁸⁴. Similarly, the differences for the Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 year occur over the Yorkshire sheriff's representative's proffer at Easter 1265, with Jacob recording a figure of £100 whilst the above table records £106 13s 4d⁸⁵. Other than these two cases, the rest of the proffer totals for the counties match for these two years. It is for the year Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 that the totals quoted by Mills and Jacob differ by a considerable amount from the figures quoted in the table above. £25 of the difference for this year can be explained by Jacob not recording the Middlesex and Surrey/ Sussex proffers for Easter 1266⁸⁶. £330 of the discrepancy stems from figures that Mills and Jacob record as being paid at the Michaelmas 1266 proffer which, in the above table, have been considered as not having been paid into the exchequer. This £330 figure comes from six counties - Cumberland, Hereford, Lancashire, Lincolnshire, Northumberland and Yorkshire. In each of these six cases, the wording of each entry is that the sheriff's representative came to the exchequer and '*optulit ad [...] m set ea die nichil tulit*'⁸⁷. This has been taken to mean that sums were offered by the representatives but were not delivered on the day of attendance, and so they have been excluded from the proffer totals for this term. At the same Michaelmas 1266 *Adventus*, and

⁸⁴E. 368/39, m. 24.

⁸⁵E. 368/39, m. 24d.

⁸⁶E. 368/40, m. 25.

⁸⁷E. 368/41, m. 17.

alongside the cases of the six above shires, there are six similar entries concerning the proffers of towns. These being Newcastle, Grimsby, Nottingham, Derby, Cambridge and Huntingdon⁸⁸. It could well be possible that these sums were subsequently paid into the exchequer at a later date but, with the receipt rolls missing, this cannot be checked out.

Other than showing that the disorder of the civil war reduced shrieval proffer payments into the exchequer, it is difficult to draw any other solid conclusions about the *Adventus Vicecomitum* during this period. However, since the largest receipts for a proffer, Easter 1265, came during de Montfort's tenure in power, this could possibly signify a limited success on the part of his regime in increasing financial receipts into the lower exchequer, and therefore could be taken to show the relative strength of his regime's hold over the shrieval office at that time, i.e. his administration was able to get so many sheriffs, or their representatives, to attend the proffer and make a payment. The low number of sheriffs making proffer payments and the low proffer totals after de Montfort's defeat at Evesham reflect the length of time it was taking for the royalist financial administration to get back to anything near normality. This point will be developed in the next chapter.

Thus, it can be seen that during the years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267, the administration of the exchequer was subject to disruption with the failure to hold two proffers for the *Adventus*, with a reduced shrieval attendance at the exchequer of audit, and low shrieval payments at the exchequer

⁸⁸E. 368/41, m. 17.

of receipt for proffers. That this occurred is not particularly surprising with the realm being in such a state of flux. What is perhaps the most important thing is, not so much the drop in the exchequer's ability to fully audit and distrain sheriffs for their accounts and dues, but rather that the exchequer's administration did not break down completely.

Bearing in mind the comments made previously about the difficulty in determining, with any degree of accuracy, an approximate estimate of revenue during these four years, the tables drawn up for the revenue categories over the next few pages must be treated carefully. There are quite sizeable differences between the totals on the adjusted and actual revenue tables, reflecting the problem of infrequent shrieval accounting at the upper exchequer during this period. This is best demonstrated by the year Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267. Ten of the fourteen shrieval accounts on the Michaelmas 1266-67 pipe roll were for periods of two or more years, resulting in the actual figures for both cash payments and for credits from this pipe roll being much larger than the adjusted figures for the 1266-67 year. This also means that the adjusted revenue figures for the three years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1266 are all higher than the figures for the actual revenue on each pipe roll for these years.

However, the conclusion that can be clearly canvassed from the tables is that cash receipts audited through the exchequer and wardrobe clearly dropped for the period Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267 as compared to the years Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1262. An adjusted average

yearly cash income figure for these latter years of £11,950 shows a 44 per cent fall in revenue as compared to the average yearly revenue of £21,394 for Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1262. This fall in cash revenue is also indicated by the *Liberate Rolls* where the totals for authorised expenditure out of the exchequer for Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267 show a similar fall, suggesting that reduced exchequer receipts resulted in a reduction in the number of *liberate* writs that could be issued allowing exchequer expenditure. The theme of expenditure and the yearly totals will be dealt with later in the chapter. As for the yearly revenue totals, the table below gives the figures drawn up for the two years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1265:-

	Adjusted		Actual	
	Mich.1263-4	Mich.1264-5	Mich.1263-4	Mich.1264-5
<u>Shire Accounts</u>				
Shire Issues	£328	£561	£278	£324
Demesne	£2260	£2422	£1814	£869
Judicial	£376	£1162	£211	£1110
Debts	£316	£329	£251	£297
Jews	£8	£11	£6	£3
Feudal	£471	£2077	£693	£1912
Taxation	£53	£615	£32	£608
Forest	£110	£90	£85	£16
Miscellaneous	£16	£253	-	£160
TOTAL	£3937	£7520	£3370	£5299
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>				
Eccl. Vacancies	£203	£412	£541	£307
Demesne	£140	£161	£242	-

Forest	-	-	-	-
Mint/Exchange	£346	£406	£1011	£786
Miscellaneous	£67	£89	-	-
Escheats/Seisins	£144	£180	£60	-
TOTAL	£900	£1248	£1854	£1093
TOTAL (Shire and Foreign)	£4837	£8768	£5224	£6392
Misc. Cash	-	-	-	-
Wardrobe Cash	£4177	£2224	£4177	£2224
TOTAL CASH	£9014	£10,992	£9401	£8616
CREDITS	£5480	£8467	£3893	£3593
TOTAL NOTIONAL INCOME	£14,494	£19,494	£13, 94	£12,209

As can be expected, the three major categories of revenue - shire issues, demesne and judicial - all show major falls from previous years. In the case of judicial receipts, this is not surprising given that there was no general eyre in progress during the period of the civil war. What receipts are audited on the pipe rolls for this time reflect amercements made outside the eyre or eyre amercements made before Michaelmas 1263 but not paid (or possibly not audited) until these two years. The figures to be noted are for the year Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265. The very large total for the feudal category stems from a sum of £1895 4s 8d audited on the Lincolnshire accounts as having been paid by Hugh Bigod for the custody of the lands of William de Kyme⁸⁹, Hugh having previously made a large fine for this

⁸⁹E. 372/109, m. 9.

custody several years earlier during the years of reform. The taxation category includes fines paid in lieu of military service to the king. These were made in the aftermath of Evesham once Henry had regained control of the government. As for the miscellaneous category, £220 of the total resulted from a fine made by the prior of St. Swithun's, Winchester, for having the king's grace⁹⁰.

The totals recorded for the foreign accounts are perhaps subject to the largest distortions. Revenue from ecclesiastical vacancies came from two sources. The receipts for Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1264 resulted from the issues of the vacancy in the Bath and Wells bishopric⁹¹, whilst those for the following year came from the vacant York archbishopric⁹². In both cases, virtually all these receipts were paid into the wardrobe. It is possible that the York figure could be an overestimate since the vacancy account continued until 20th December 1266 and hence some of this total might not have been paid until after Michaelmas 1265. The receipts from escheats/ seisins, though not a great sum in either case, are an increase on previous years and whilst this could well reflect the greater availability of such feudal issues to the king resulting from chance deaths, these totals are unreliable in that the bulk of these receipts come from escheators' accounts for these two years that were audited after Michaelmas 1265 on the pipe rolls. Thus, from the point of view of cash flow, receipts into the exchequer or wardrobe from these sources could actually

⁹⁰E. 372/109, m. 11.

⁹¹E. 372/108, m. 30.

⁹²E. 372/109, m. 23; E. 372/110, m. 25-6.

have occurred after Michaelmas 1265. Alongside this, there is a problem over the dates of escheators' accounts. For example, on the Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll, William de Clifford accounted for several different escheats between 1264-68⁹³. Since his total payments have been divided up by four to achieve a yearly figure for issues from these sources, which have then been assigned to the financial years Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1268, the resultant totals for escheats/ seisins on the adjusted revenue tables possibly bear little similarity to what the actual cash flow was from these feudal sources.

The dominant reason for the low figures for revenue received from demesne issues lies of course with the disturbances caused by the civil war. There are records for the period Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1265 of allowances being made, due to expenses incurred or damages sustained in the war, against the payment of farms due to the crown. In November 1263, James de Audley was pardoned £40, which he should have paid at the Michaelmas 1263 exchequer for the farm of Newcastle under Lyme, in compensation for losses sustained during the disturbances of that year⁹⁴. Three months later, in February 1264, the bailiffs of the towns of Worcester, Hereford and Shrewsbury were ordered to deliver their farms for the next Easter and Michaelmas terms to Edward, the king's son, so that he could dispatch '*most urgent business of the king*'⁹⁵. In December 1264, the citizens of Winchester '*as the city is so impoverished that the*

⁹³E. 372/111, mm. 53, 54

⁹⁴CLR, 1260-67, p. 123.

⁹⁵CLR, 1260-67, p. 131.

buildings are in ruins' were granted that, as from Michaelmas 1264 and for 21 years, their farm at the exchequer would be reduced to 100m year from £80⁹⁶. In April 1265, the reforming council granted to the citizens of Hereford, in compensation for damages during the civil war, that the city would be let off £100 for their farm at the exchequer for the five terms Michaelmas 1264, Easter and Michaelmas 1265, and Easter and Michaelmas 1266⁹⁷. Also in 1265, the fine and originalia rolls record the burgesses of Gloucester as being pardoned of 100m of their town farm⁹⁸. Cases such as these highlight the damage done during the civil war and the effect that it had on farm revenue. However, such exemptions do not fully explain the fall in demesne revenue. Rather, as is shown by the number of *allocate* and *contrabreve* writs in the *Liberate Rolls*, potential demesne revenue to the exchequer or wardrobe was ordered to be expended on a local level on expenses associated with the war, i.e. on purchases, munitions and wages. For example, on the Michaelmas 1264-65 pipe roll in the shire accounts for Gloucester more than half the demesne revenue that was audited was not actually paid to the exchequer or wardrobe. Expenses for wages, munitions and building works covered £354 of the audited demesne issues with £249 6s being paid into the wardrobe and exchequer⁹⁹.

There are also a few cases where patronage would have diminished the possible farm receipts. For example, in

⁹⁶CPR, 1258-66, p. 391.

⁹⁷CLR, 1260-67, p. 173.

⁹⁸E. 371/29, m. 7; C. 60/62, m. 3.

⁹⁹E. 372/109, mm.19,20,21,22. .

December 1263, Henry granted land out in two cases. Hamo Lestrangle was given Ellesmere manor to keep for seventeen years in lieu of his 30m fee, having to answer for any residue above 30m year at the exchequer¹⁰⁰. Roger de Mortimer was granted £100 a year out of the farm of the king's manors of Norton and Bromsgrove in Worcester until he could be provided with an equivalent out of escheats '*or other lands not of the king's demesne or crown*'¹⁰¹. Following Lewes, in November 1264, Peter de Montfort was granted Garthorp manor in lieu of part of his fee that he received at the exchequer¹⁰². Simon de Montfort, in April 1265, received the stannary of Devon for three years so as to receive from it 100m a year of the £400 a year that he was to receive each year at the exchequer for the dower of his wife¹⁰³. Such grants, although making a contribution to the decline in demesne cash revenue, do actually total very little, which is not surprising since any alienation of the royal demesne by the reformers would have gone against one of the principal tenets of the reforming ideals,

Where the crown lost out as regards potential revenue was in the sphere of feudal revenue arising from wardships and forfeitures resulting from the civil war. However, before Lewes, Henry had disbursed feudal rights to some of the leading magnates as patronage. In late 1263, William de Valence received

¹⁰⁰CPR, 1258-66, pp. 302-304. This manor had previously been committed to Peter de Montfort by the king.

¹⁰¹CPR, 1258-66, p. 302-3.

¹⁰²CPR, 1258-66, p. 389.

¹⁰³CPR, 1258-66, p. 418

the wardship of the lands late of Stephen Cressy in lieu of his money fee, whilst Richard of Cornwall was granted the wardship of the lands late of Roger de Mowbray¹⁰⁴. Once the civil war had fully broken out, initial successes for the royalist side resulted in the king committing the lands of defeated opponents to his supporters. In the month prior to Lewes, John de Grey, William de Grey, Hugh Bigod, Robert Aguilun, John de Warenne and William de Valence all received such grants¹⁰⁵. With the royalist defeat at Lewes such grants were nullified as de Montfort's supporters were rewarded with the keepership of the lands of many of Henry's major followers. The lands of Hugh Bigod, William de Valence, John de Warenne and Peter of Savoy were committed into the hands of de Montfort's followers with the commands to answer for the issues '*at the king's mandate*'¹⁰⁶. These grants were not gifts and hence the issues of these lands belonged, in theory, to the crown. However, in practice nothing seems to have come the way of the exchequer with no payments or accounts having been traced for the keepership of these lands.

There is little evidence to suggest any widespread selling of feudal rights during this period. No cases have been traced before Lewes, though there are a few during de Montfort's tenure in power. Thomas son of Thomas made a 200m fine for the wardship of the lands and heirs of Robert le Blund in the summer of 1264, which was paid into the wardrobe¹⁰⁷. John son of John

¹⁰⁴CPR, 1258-66, pp. 297, 304.

¹⁰⁵CPR, 1258-66, pp. 313-16.

¹⁰⁶CPR, 1258-66, pp. 321, 322, 326, 333.

¹⁰⁷E. 371/28, m. 3; CPR, 1258-66, p. 341, 353.

was granted, for a £200 fine, the wardship of the land and heirs of Thomas de Hengrave¹⁰⁸. The largest feudal fine made was by Hugh le Despenser for 700m for the wardship of the manors of Kneesall and Wadenhoe for a period of seven years from Michaelmas 1264. Hugh only paid 100m for this grant (which was paid into the wardrobe) as 500m of the fine was deducted from his 1000m fee as justiciar whilst he was pardoned the remaining 100m¹⁰⁹. Alice, late the wife of Ralph de Trop, made a £100 fine for the wardship of the lands and heirs of her former husband¹¹⁰. Robert de Insula, for a 200m fine, received the wardship of the lands and heirs of William de Albiniaco¹¹¹. The number of such large fines, on average, are no less than in the years before the civil war, but, given the amount of land available to the crown (or rather de Montfort's administration) such low numbers demonstrate that very little potential revenue was actually translated into cash for the crown.

The figures from the adjusted revenue table imply that the king was receiving almost as much money direct into the wardrobe as was being paid into the exchequer for the Michaelmas 1263-64 year. The accounts that cover this year suggest that the majority of these receipts were probably paid into the wardrobe before Henry's defeat at Lewes. With the disorganised state of the exchequer in the Michaelmas 1263 term and the low level of receipts from the proffers of that term (only

¹⁰⁸*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 349.

¹⁰⁹*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 351-2.

¹¹⁰*E. 371/28*, m. 5; *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 354.

¹¹¹*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 390.

£746 1m), it is likely that the king was receiving very little money from the exchequer in the period from September 1263 to May 1264. Thus, he would have had to find his income from elsewhere. A number of loans for the 1263-64 year are listed in the wardrobe accounts, totalling £1438 1m, the largest being for £1333 6s 8d and which was received from the king's brother, the Earl of Cornwall¹¹². In addition the accounts mention that £683 5s 10s was received in this year from sale of the king's jewels¹¹³. Therefore, it would appear that Henry was raising cash through selling his treasure and borrowing money.

Three separate wardrobe accounts cover the subsequent year, Michaelmas 1264-5. The first quarter of this year is contained in Henry de Gant's account for the period 26 July 1261 to 31 December 1264¹¹⁴. The first seven months of 1265 are covered by Ralph of Sandwich's account¹¹⁵, with the final two months contained in Nicholas de Leukenore's account for 7 August 1265 to 3 March 1268¹¹⁶. Therefore any clear interpretation of the de Montfort regime's attitude towards the financing of the wardrobe has to stem from the account presented by Ralph of Sandwich. The receipts of the wardrobe during these first seven months of 1265 were relatively small, totalling only £2754 10d, of which about half of this sum, £1371 19s, resulted through direct payments from the exchequer, with a further £650 coming from

¹¹²E. 372/113, m. 3.

¹¹³E. 372/113, m. 3.

¹¹⁴E. 372/111, mm. 3, 4.

¹¹⁵E. 372/114, m. 40d.

¹¹⁶E. 372/115, mm. 2, 1d.

loans and prests¹¹⁷. Thus, it would appear that the reformers were trying to finance the wardrobe mainly through transfers of cash from the exchequer, the proportion of wardrobe receipts that came direct from the exchequer being higher for Ralph's tenure as keeper of the wardrobe than for any of the other wardrobe accounts submitted for the period 1255-70. This could suggest that de Montfort's regime was trying to abide by the relevant demand in the Provisions of Oxford for all revenue to be paid into the exchequer¹¹⁸.

It is not clear what the success of the financial administration of de Montfort's regime between Lewes and Evesham was. The financial tables above show contrasting pictures. The adjusted revenue suggests that both cash income and total notional income went up for the year 1264-65 as compared to the previous year, whilst the actual revenue table implies that there was very little difference between the two years. Therefore, the figures for income are not helpful for determining the success of his regime, though other evidence suggests that perhaps the regime was pursuing a slightly more active approach to exchequer administration as compared to the years either side of the reformers time in power.

The memoranda roll for Michaelmas 1264 to Trinity 1265, whilst noting the usual commands for the distraint of former sheriffs for arrears of their shrieval accounts, also contains a few entries ordering sheriffs to make inquiries into what monies former sheriffs received from the pleas and presentments that

¹¹⁷E. 372/114, m. 40d.

¹¹⁸*DBM*, p. 107.

came before them¹¹⁹. There is also an entry concerning fining the Devon sheriff at 100s a day for late attendance at the exchequer of audit¹²⁰. The latter entry might suggest a tightening up of procedure at the exchequer in its dealings with the sheriffs, whilst the inquiries into pleas and presentments could reflect attempts to examine shrieval administration in the shires, i.e. finding out how much money they were getting from particular sources of revenue. However, the above entries, on their own, do not signify any major activity by the reformers in improving the administration of the exchequer. It is from the previously mentioned area of shrieval audits and proffers that a more effective working exchequer is suggested for the year of de Montfort's rule. The pipe roll that was audited during this time was that for Michaelmas 1263-64 and more sheriffs were called to audit for this pipe roll year than in the years either side of the reforming regime. Likewise, the Easter 1265 *Adventus Vicecomitum* had a higher numbers of sheriffs (or their representatives) attending the exchequer and paying money into it than any other term in the period Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1270, other than the Easter 1270 term¹²¹. Thus, the conclusion on the de Montfort regime is that there are signs that a more active exchequer was at work, i.e. more successful in getting

¹¹⁹E. 368/39, m. 9d. There were five sheriffs ordered to make such inquiries, those for Lancashire, Yorkshire, Buckingham/ Bedford, Essex/ Herts and Norfolk/ Suffolk.

¹²⁰E. 368/39, m. 11.

¹²¹See next chapter for the proffer and attendance totals at the exchequer for the years after Michaelmas 1267.

sheriffs to attend both the upper and lower exchequers, but that it cannot be determined whether this success was reflected in the income figures for the crown.

Following de Montfort's defeat at Evesham and Henry's regaining of control over the administration, the receipts audited by the exchequer show a sizeable increase for total notional income for Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267 as compared to the previous two years. The figures for cash income audited on the pipe rolls vary considerably between the adjusted and actual revenue tables. The adjusted figures for pipe roll income for Michaelmas 1266-67 are lower than the adjusted figures for the previous two years, yet for the actual revenue table they are over 50 per cent higher. Therefore, given this inconsistency, the figures for cash income audited on the pipe rolls are not necessarily an adequate way of analysing revenue trends during this period. What the tables do show is that the reason for the higher total notional income figures for Michaelmas 1265-67 stems from the increased amount of credits on the pipe rolls for these two years along with an increase in wardrobe cash receipts. The adjusted figures for total notional income for the two years Michaelmas 1265-67 are more or less at the same level as the equivalent figures for the mid 1250s.

The table below gives the revenue figures for Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267:-

Adjusted		Actual	
Mich.1265-6	Mich.1266-7	Mich.1265-6	Mich.1266-7
<u>Shire Accounts</u>			

Shire Issues	£562	£406	£145	£1079
Demesne	£2693	£2124	£2325	£4524
Judicial	£528	£453	£211	£913
Debts	£935	£573	£769	£613
Jews	£10	£5	£13	£11
Feudal	£223	£98	£268	£261
Taxation	£352	£612	£94	£864
Forest	£375	£98	£326	£284
Miscellaneous	£231	£224	£8	£440
TOTAL	£5909	£4593	£4159	£8989
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>				
Eccl. Vacancies	£846	£176	£1127	-
Demesne	£86	£57	£29	-
Forest	-	-	-	-
Mint/Exchange	£794	£435	£314	-
Miscellaneous	£90	£123	-	-
Escheats/Seisins	£310	£267	-	£782
TOTAL	£2126	£1058	£1470	£782
TOTAL (Shire and Foreign)	£8035	£5651	£5629	£9771
Misc. Cash	-	-	-	-
Wardrobe Cash	£6319	£7792	£6319	£7792
TOTAL CASH	£14,354	£13,443	£11,948	£17,563
CREDITS	£14,213	£10,603	£9605	£18,439
TOTAL NOTIONAL				
INCOME	£28,567	£24,046	£21,553	£36,002

Shire issues, demesne and judicial revenue do not show any notable rise over the Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas

1265 period. The reasons for this being very much similar to the earlier period, i.e. no general eyre and the effects of civil war. Remission of monies due at the exchequer continued. Roger de Leybourne, in November 1265, was pardoned from accounting and reckoning for the time that he was sheriff of Kent with his arrears also being pardoned¹²². The town of Southampton, in its farm on the Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 pipe roll, was pardoned £93 for damages sustained during the civil war¹²³. In January 1267, the bailiffs of Portsmouth were allocated £20 in their farm for Michaelmas 1266 for damages sustained in the king's service¹²⁴. They had been previously granted, in February 1266, in consideration of their losses, that they could keep their town farm for five years from Michaelmas 1266¹²⁵. Similarly, the town of Bridgenorth was allowed to keep its farm for five years from the same date (though its officials did pay £16 into the wardrobe for the financial year following Michaelmas 1266)¹²⁶. However, in the cases of shire issues and demesne revenue, the dominant reason for the low receipts was not so much due to pardons of money owed, but rather to *allocate* writs issued to bailiffs, sheriffs and local officials reimbursing them for expenses sustained during the war.

¹²²CPR, 1258-66, p. 497, 498. On the Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 pipe roll it mentions that Roger was not summoned to account for any county increment (E. 372/109, m. 15d).

¹²³E. 372/110, m. 8.

¹²⁴CLR, 1260-67, p. 260.

¹²⁵CPR, 1258-66, p. 559.

¹²⁶CPR, 1266-72, p. 106.

The taxation and miscellaneous categories, though not producing particularly large sums, contain payments resulting directly from the outcome of the civil war. Fines made with the king in lieu of military service have been included in the taxation category, whilst fines made for having the king's goodwill are placed in the miscellaneous section. The first of these latter type of fines made was by the city of Hereford in August 1265, whose citizens made a 560m fine with the king '*for his grace*'¹²⁷. A couple of months later, similar fines for 400m and 500m were made by the abbot of St. Edmunds and the prior of St. Swithun's respectively¹²⁸. The bulk of these type of fines were made during the regnal year 50 Henry III (October 1265 to October 1266) and, in some cases, involved those making the fine receiving back into their possession lands previously forfeited. For this particular year, eight fines over 100m have been traced, by which either towns or people were received back into the king's grace, totalling £15,680 in value. The overwhelming share of this sum came from the 20,000m fine that the citizens of London made for a royal pardon for their behaviour during the war¹²⁹. The next largest fine was for 1500m which the Earl of Derby made in December 1265 for the remittance '*of all rancour and indignation of mind conceived against him by the king*'¹³⁰. Two 500m fines were made in April 1266 by the burgesses of Oxford and by John le Chapler, a London citizen, with Edward, the king's son in exchange for

¹²⁷E. 371/29, m. 9; CPR, 1258-66, p. 445-6.

¹²⁸E. 371/29, m. 9; C. 60/63, m. 8.

¹²⁹E. 371/30, m. 10; CPR, 1258-66, p. 530-31.

¹³⁰E. 371/30, m. 2; CPR, 1258-66, p. 517-18; C. 60/63, m. 9.

pardons of the king's indignity against them¹³¹. A similar sized fine had been made by the Bishop of Lincoln two months earlier in February 1266¹³². Whilst another bishop, that of Salisbury, in January 1266, made a 300m fine for remission of the king's rancour against him¹³³. The two other fines concerned the burgesses of Beverley, who made a £80 fine in November 1265, while Richard le Caretter, a individual burgess of Beverley, was fined 100m in March 1266¹³⁴. For the following year, from Michaelmas 1266, the number and total value of these fines falls. There is one clear example of such a fine being made, with two possible others. The definite fine made was by the citizens of Lincoln, in February 1267, for £1000 by which they were pardoned of trespasses made and admitted to the king's grace¹³⁵. Of the possible cases, the abbot of St. Edmunds, on the October 1266 to October 1267 originalia roll, was recorded as making a 200m fine for the king's goodwill¹³⁶. However, this might possibly be connected with the 400m fine made in 1265, as mentioned above, especially since the *Patent Rolls*, for June 1266, record a payment of 200m by the abbot¹³⁷. The other possible case is a fine of 30m by which the men of Oxford were pardoned of

¹³¹E. 371/30, m. 10; *CPR, 1258-66*, pp. 576, 579

¹³²E. 371/30, m. 10; *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 555.

¹³³E. 371/30, m. 10; *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 537.

¹³⁴E. 371/30, m. 10; *CPR, 1258-66*, pp. 499, 571.

¹³⁵E. 371/31, m. 8; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 34.

¹³⁶E. 371/31, m. 4.

¹³⁷*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 604.

transgressions¹³⁸. It is not clear whether this was connected with the previous fine made by the city or was an additional fine. The final mention of a fine made concerning behaviour during this period is connected with the Earl of Gloucester. Following his march on and occupation of London, Gloucester came to an agreement with the king whereby he offered a surety of 10,000m that he would not '*move against the king*'¹³⁹. Only a small percentage of the above fines were actually translated into cash being paid into the exchequer. The money that was paid over to the king mainly went into the wardrobe. Instead, the bulk of the value of these fines was not handed over directly to the king but was used to pay off loans, debts and purchases which the king and his supporters had entered into during the course of the civil war.

The category for income from feudal rights is perhaps surprisingly low given the amount of land coming into the king's hands following Evesham. This occurrence reflects the granting of such land by the king as patronage and reward for service on the royalist side. However, not that many fines for feudal rights were entered into with the crown either - only six of any size have been traced, the largest of which was a 1000m fine which the Count of Lavagna made for the wardship of the heirs and lands of Ralph de Neville¹⁴⁰. Three of the fines made - 500m by Guy de Charron for the wardship of the lands and heirs of Thomas de Rihull, £60 by Roger de Lancaster for the wardship of the lands

¹³⁸E. 371//31, m. 7.

¹³⁹CPR, 1266-72, p. 70-72.

¹⁴⁰CPR, 1258-66, p. 676. He subsequently sold this wardship onto Maud de Neville, the wife of Ralph.

and heirs of Henry de Croft, and 400m by Clemence late the wife of Robert de Scales for the wardship of the lands and heirs of her husband - had the proceeds passed over to John of Brittany in part satisfaction of the debts owed to him by the king¹⁴¹. John had been granted 4000m by the king in June 1266 for arrears of money which the king owed him. This 4000m was to be paid out of the issues of escheats, wardships and vacant church lands¹⁴². It was this grant that mainly explains the low figure for feudal cash receipts on the pipe rolls. The two escheat accounts on the Michaelmas 1266-67 pipe roll record a total of 1238m as having been paid over to John from the issues of escheats pertaining to the crown¹⁴³. The other two fines concerned the estate of Hugh de Polsted. Hawise, one of Hugh's heirs, made a 20m fine to marry who she wanted in February 1266¹⁴⁴. Whilst the following month, Robert Walerand made a 40m fine for the marriage rights of the remaining heirs of Hugh¹⁴⁵.

As for the other categories of revenue, there does not seem to be anything significant about them. Foreign account receipts from escheats/ seisin for both years are higher than in previous years from Michaelmas 1255 onwards, a reflection of more land coming into the remit of escheators as a result of the civil war. The income from ecclesiastical vacancies came from the York archbishopric. However, the figure for this category is an

¹⁴¹*CPR, 1266-1272*, pp. 63, 82, 115.

¹⁴²*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 668.

¹⁴³E. 372/111, mm. 54, 56.

¹⁴⁴*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 572.

¹⁴⁵E. 371/30, m. 10.

underestimate of what the receipts actually were since there seems to be missing accounts for certain ecclesiastical vacancies. The *Patent Rolls* record payments into the wardrobe for 1267 for receipts from the issues of the bishoprics of Bath and Wells¹⁴⁶, yet the account for this vacancy on the Michaelmas 1266-67 pipe roll makes no mention of any such payment¹⁴⁷.

The account that covers wardrobe receipts for Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267 is that of Nicholas de Leukenore which dates from 7 August 1265 to 3 March 1268¹⁴⁸. Quite large sums of money have been entered in the table for both these years under the category for wardrobe receipts not audited through the exchequer. This implies that the king was using the wardrobe as his dominant means of receiving income in the years after the civil war since only a small proportion of the wardrobe receipts during Nicholas's tenure were direct transfers from the exchequer - £3118 9s 3d out of total receipts of £28,801¹⁴⁹. With the exchequer working at less than full efficiency or effectiveness in the years after the civil war, as shown in the low figures for attendance and receipts at the twice yearly shrieval proffers, payment of dues straight into the wardrobe was a less cumbersome way for the king to receive money.

In contrast to working out yearly revenue, which is distorted by the problem of infrequent account audits and no

¹⁴⁶*CPR, 1266-1272*, pp. 51.

¹⁴⁷E. 372/111, m. 55.

¹⁴⁸E. 372/115, mm. 2, 1d.

¹⁴⁹E. 372/115, m. 2.

receipt rolls, it is easier to determine yearly totals for authorised expenditure out of the exchequer since the *Liberate Rolls* are more or less complete for the period. However, with no issue rolls surviving, it is not possible to check whether such authorised expenditure actually took place. However, this does not particularly matter in that the bulk of expenditure authorised for this period came in the form of *allocate* and *contrabreve* writs to local officials. Hence, as a means of expenditure, the exchequer was relatively unimportant. This reflects both the lack of revenue coming into the exchequer and the turbulent state of the country whereby, at times of royalist ascendancy, it was easier for the king to direct revenue direct into the wardrobe. Alongside this, with the dominant demands on government resources (whether controlled by the king or de Montfort) being the payment of soldiers, the creation of adequate defences for towns and castles and the arranging of munitions, it was simpler for expenditure to take place at a local level through local officials, acting on writs issued through the seal, directing potential exchequer revenue into covering their costs.

Bearing in mind the above, the authorised exchequer expenditure tables drawn up do not accurately reflect the actual expenditure authorised by the government. Whilst this hinders any importance that could be attached to these tables, there are still a few notable points that the entries in the *Liberate Rolls* raise. The tables below shows the category breakdown of expenditure authorised out of the exchequer for the years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1265 and the totals on the pipe rolls for these years for credits:-

Authorised *Liberate* Writ Totals

Category	Mich. 1263-64	Mich. 1264-65
Alms	£10	-
Wages/Maintenance	£20	£63
Gift	£60	£39
Building Works	£200	£206
Purchases/Munitions	£43	£1072
Fee	£423	£510
Admin. /Expenses	-	£284
Miscellaneous	£67	£861
Wardrobe	£200 ¹⁵⁰	£2024
TOTAL	£1023	£5059

Pipe Roll Credits

	Mich. 1263-64	Mich. 1264-65
Alms	£208	£106
Wages/Maintenance	£982	£722
Gift	£86	£42
Building Works	£529	£413
Purchases/Munitions	£1017	£1075
Pardon	£649	£451
Fee	£153	£425
Miscellaneous	£117	£322
Admin. /Expenses	£152	£37
TOTAL	£3893	£3593

¹⁵⁰Unclear whether this payment was for this year or for the following year (*CLR*, 1260-67, p. 142).

The very low figure for Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1264 for authorised exchequer issues is very much to be expected as, for much of this year, the exchequer was in a disorganised state. In fact, all of this expenditure was authorised during the first half of this financial year - the last authorised *liberate* writ being for the 15th March 1264¹⁵¹. Since there was no Easter 1264 *Adventus Vicecomitum* and no sheriffs called to audit their accounts at the exchequer after February 1264, it is probable that, from March onwards, the exchequer did not receive any receipts. Hence, it would not have been able to pay any money out. Thus, from April all writs enrolled on the *Liberate Rolls* for this year are *allocate* and *contrabreve* writs. In fact, the total of *liberate* writs only falls slightly short of the total money brought in at the Michaelmas 1263 proffer by the sheriffs and bailiffs of the towns. The *Adventus Vicecomitum* for that term recording £1397 8s 7d as having been received by the exchequer from these officials¹⁵². The only *liberate* writ perhaps worth noting for this year concerns Simon de Montfort. Nearly half the total figure for authorised fee payments stems from a *liberate* writ for £200 granted to Simon in November 1263 for the Michaelmas 1263 term of the yearly dower he received for his wife¹⁵³.

The increase in exchequer expenditure for the following year probably reflects upon the more settled state of the

¹⁵¹Excluding the query over the £200 payment into the wardrobe at the end of the financial year.

¹⁵²E. 368/38, m. 14.

¹⁵³CLR, 1260-67, p. 125.

exchequer. The miscellaneous category for Michaelmas 1264 to Michaelmas 1265 contains three writs, totalling £500, connected with reimbursing Simon de Montfort and his son, Simon, for their expenses sustained at the siege of Pevensey¹⁵⁴. The category concerning exchequer payments into the wardrobe possibly suggests a greater effort to finance the wardrobe out of the exchequer.

As for the years Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267, the tables below shows the authorised expenditure out of the exchequer for these years and the credits enrolled on the pipe rolls:-

	Authorised <i>Liberate</i> Writs	
	Mich. 1265-66	Mich. 1266-67
Alms	£157	-
Wages/Maintenance	£172	£134
Gift	£78	£88
Building Works	£928	£73
Purchases/Munitions	£966	£1287
Fee	£677	£495
Admin. /Expenses	£680	£67
Miscellaneous	£359	£313
Wardrobe	£2547	£137
TOTAL	£6564	£2594

Pipe Roll Credits

Mich. 1265-66	Mich. 1266-67
---------------	---------------

¹⁵⁴CLR, 1260-67, pp. 145, 152, 163.

Alms	£133	£264
Wages/Maintenance	£4164	£5588
Gift	£424	£350
Building Works	£473	£1040
Purchases/Munitions	£1426	£2358
Pardon	£593	£3398
Fee	£435	£640
Miscellaneous	£1147	£4427
Admin. /Expenses	£810	£374
TOTAL	£9605	£18,439

Authorised expenditure out of the exchequer increases slightly for Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1266 over the previous year, and then falls again for Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267. In the case of the latter year, the failure to hold the Easter 1267 *Adventus Vicecomitum* would have diminished receipts into the lower exchequer, hence reducing the amount of money that could be paid out. However, in contrast to the previous time when there was no Easter *Adventus*, a sizeable share of the authorised *liberate* writ expenditure for Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 came after Easter 1267 - approximately £930. Whilst this might suggest that there was cash in the exchequer after Easter 1267, there is other evidence to suggest that there was probably not enough to cover all of these writs. £270 worth of *liberate* writs were issued in September 1267 and therefore it is likely that they were not honoured until the following financial year (after Michaelmas 1267), whilst a 500m *liberate* writ, from July 1267, to Alan la Zuche, constable of the Tower of London, suggests that payment of this writ was not to be

forthcoming until November¹⁵⁵. Thus, it seems likely that very little money was actually paid out of the exchequer after Easter 1267. In general, the bulk of the expenditure authorised on the *Liberate Rolls* for Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267, approximately two thirds of it, was through the use of *allocate* and *contrabreve* writs as opposed to *liberate* writs. This being reflected in the high totals for credits on the pipe rolls. There is very little sign of money due, or coming in, at the exchequer being specifically ear marked for particular expenditure. Only one writ has been traced that might suggest this - a 100m *liberate* writ to the keeper of the works at Westminster, from February 1266, the money for which was to come from the debts due at the exchequer from the Countess of Aumale¹⁵⁶.

Throughout the four years from Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267, the yearly totals for the authorisation of fee payments are very low, no longer being the largest expenditure category. Two major reasons for this can be canvassed. Firstly, the dominant demand made on expenditure during all four years would have been on munitions for the supply of soldiers and for the defence of castles/ towns and on expenses, of whatever sort, associated with the war. Thus the payment of fees would not have been such a high priority, whilst during de Montfort's tenure in power, it would not have been in the political or financial interests of his regime to honour fees previously granted by the king. Secondly, following Evesham, the amount of land pertaining to the crown as escheats would have provided plenty of opportunity for

¹⁵⁵CLR, 1260-67, p. 285.

¹⁵⁶CLR, 1260-67, p. 202.

the king to provide his patronage through land grants as opposed to money fees. There are very few entries, after Michaelmas 1265, in which fees were paid out of the exchequer due to a lack of escheats or wardships that had been promised to the recipient of the writ. The three such *liberate* writs for these two years just total £75 8s 4d¹⁵⁷.

The totals recorded above for fee payments underestimate the amount of money being paid out as fees in that *allocate* and *contrabreve* writs were also being issued ordering local officials to make such payments. The *Patent Rolls*, for example, especially during the 1266-67 year, contain many entries ordering the payment of fees and fee arrears by local officials. This is partly reflected in the credit table where the total for fee payments goes up slightly for Michaelmas 1266-67 as compared to the previous three years. However, most of these writs referred to orders to the collectors of ecclesiastical tenth to pay out fees from the issues of the tax¹⁵⁸. However, it still seems fair to say that authorised fee payments fell for these four years since the number of writs, whether *liberate*, *allocate* or *contrabreve*, issued is much less, on a yearly basis, than the numbers being issued between Michaelmas 1255 to Michaelmas 1262. A memo from October 1267, at the end of the October 1266-67 *Liberate Roll*, points to a change of attitude as regards the granting of fees which possibly could have come into effect before the 20th October, the date of the memo. The memo states that the *Patent Rolls* were to be inspected for fees and fee arrears

¹⁵⁷CLR, 1260-67, p. 187-8, 253, 254.

¹⁵⁸The details of this tax will be commented upon in the next chapter.

paid to people out of the ecclesiastical tenth granted to the king and the total worked out. It then goes on to state that:

*'From now all fees are prohibited and (it is provided?) that no man take a fee but those who are attendant on the king's service in divers bailiwicks. If any letters patent are found concerning grants of such fees, let them be of no force, because such fees are entirely annulled. This annulment is made by the king's council and by his own order.'*¹⁵⁹

This suggests that the reformers' complaints about the granting of fees had been accepted as a valid grievance, and that, following the civil war, steps were being taken to reduce the wastage of money on fees for patronage purposes. Since it is in the years following Michaelmas 1267 that this policy can be most clearly seen at work, this point will be developed in the next chapter.

What is clearly apparent from the above tables is that the bulk of expenditure taking place was via credits recorded on the pipe rolls, i.e. local officials being granted allowances, in the audit of their accounts at the upper exchequer, for money they had spent at a local level. These credits were predominantly for expenses incurred during the civil war. The Michaelmas 1266-67 pipe roll, in particular, reflects this with the category of wages/maintenance showing an abnormally high figure. This partly stems from an audit in the foreign accounts for Roger de Leybourne. This account listed the income and expenditure received and spent by Roger in the pursuit of his duties in the various offices he held during the period 1263-67. Roger was

¹⁵⁹CLR, 1260-67. p. 298.

given a credit allowance of £3478 3s 5. 5d for expenses he had incurred for this period, of which just over half has been placed in the wages/ maintenance category (some £2081)¹⁶⁰. The other £3500 contained in this particular category derived from a variety of different audits in the shire accounts.

Of the other major categories of expenditure, those for purchases/ munitions and building works also went up for this Michaelmas 1266-67 year, which is to be expected, though the size of their increases is not so severe as that for wages/ maintenance. The very large totals for pardons and miscellaneous also stand out for this year. Part of the reason for the large total for pardons stems from the king letting off boroughs/ cities for their dues (as mentioned earlier), but the majority of this total stems from just two pardons. The Earl of Gloucester was let off £900 of the £1000 fine he had made for having the lands of his father before he had reached his majority¹⁶¹, whilst William le Latimer was pardoned of £1891 14. 5d from the various dues he owed the king for his offices¹⁶². Similarly, about half the large miscellaneous total stems from just two allowances, £1265 18s being made over to Roger de Leybourne and to Roger de Clifford for costs sustained when in the service of the king¹⁶³, with 1238m being paid to John of Brittany out of the escheator's accounts for money the king had promised him¹⁶⁴. In general, the large figure

¹⁶⁰E. 372/111, m. 55d.

¹⁶¹E. 372/111, m. 24d; *CPR*, 1258-66, p. 553.

¹⁶²E. 372/111, m. 14d.

¹⁶³E. 372/111, m. 27d.

¹⁶⁴E. 372/111, mm. 54, 56.

for credits on the Michaelmas 1266-67 pipe roll reflects the result of the process of clearing up the administrative mess left by the civil war, i.e. the allowances to be given out to officials for expenditure on the king's behalf during the civil war and the auditing of extended shire accounts (accounts of two or more years).

The period 1263-65 therefore sees a drop in royal revenue as compared to the years 1255-63, which is to be expected given the conflict of that period. These years were then followed by an increase in the figures for total notional income for the crown. However, although the adjusted total notional income figures for Michaelmas 1265-67 are at levels equivalent to those of the mid 1250s, this reflects the large credit allowances being made on the pipe rolls for expenditure during the civil war. The figures for cash receipts from the shire and foreign accounts still remained at very low levels compared to the pre-war years. Thus the improvements in the king's financial situation for the 1265-67 years as implied by the revenue tables reflect attempts by the exchequer at clearing up the administrative mess caused by the civil war. The king's victory at Evesham had not yet been translated into a marked increase in cash revenue for the crown.

The effectiveness of the crown's financial administration during this period was variable. During the course of the period Michaelmas 1263 to the Summer of 1264, exchequer procedure was severely disrupted by the drift to and then start of the civil war, culminating in the failure to hold the 1264 Easter exchequer session. However, following de Montfort's victory at Lewes, he was able to re-establish the exchequer's authority to a

certain degree with an increase in both shrieval attendance and in the value of the receipts at the shrieval proffers, thus suggesting an element of success in his attempts to impose his regime's authority over shrieval administration in the localities. Following his defeat at Evesham and the return of the government into the hands of the king, improvements in the administration of the exchequer were not quickly forthcoming, implying that the disorder in the country was hampering its effectiveness as a means of receipt and audit. The process of full recovery for the king's financial administration was to prove to be a long one.

Chapter 7

The Aftermath of the Civil War, 1267-70

The process of returning to normality for the exchequer was a slow one and it does not appear to have been completed by Michaelmas 1270. Although shrieval attendance, whether by the sheriff in person or his representative, at the exchequers of receipt and audit increased as compared with the years Michaelmas 1263 to Michaelmas 1267, as did the yearly proffer payments by the sheriffs, the numbers and sums involved were less than the years before the outbreak of civil war. It was not until the early years of Edward I's reign that shrieval attendance at and payments into the exchequer as part of the *Adventi Vicecomitum* reached the levels of the 1250s¹.

The years of the civil war had disrupted the collection of revenues by sheriffs and hence, from Michaelmas 1267, the exchequer had to give allowances to the civil war sheriffs in their accounts for losses sustained during the war and for the inability of certain sheriffs to cover their dues at the exchequer through being unable to collect income pertaining to the crown. In March

¹M. H. Mills, "'Adventus Vicecomitum", 1258-72', *EHR*, 36 (1921), pp. 488, 492, 494.

1268, Roger de Clifford was pardoned all debts, accounts, reckonings and arrears for which he was bound to the king at the exchequer for the time that he was the Gloucester sheriff and keeper of certain castles and manors. In return, Roger remitted to the king all debts which were due to him from the king². Mattias Bezil, the sheriff of Gloucester from whom Roger de Clifford had taken over the office, similarly had his account arrears cancelled and the fixed increment which he owed for Michaelmas 1262 to Trinity 1263 was not summoned³. In September 1268, the *Patent Rolls* record that, following a search of the exchequer records, it was found that the king owed £394 2s 4. 5d to Adam de Gesemuth for his term as Northumberland sheriff and constable of the castle of Newcastle (which was from Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1264)⁴. This sum was then ordered to be paid to Adam out of the next Northumberland and Cumberland eyre, the Michaelmas 1270 to Michaelmas 1271 pipe roll recording that this order had been carried out⁵. Robert Aguilon, the Surrey/ Sussex sheriff for 1268, was pardoned of £20 of the arrears of his account in January 1269 for money that he could not levy by reason of the late disturbance of the realm⁶. Ralph de Gorges, the Devon sheriff between Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267, was, in April 1269, let off a £27 fine he had incurred for not coming to account at the exchequer and for the non return of writs. The king let him off

²CPR, 1266-72, p. 212.

³E. 372/113, m. 5.

⁴CPR, 1266-72, p. 257-8.

⁵E. 372/115, m. 35d.

⁶CLR, 1267-72, p. 60; E. 372/112, m. 25.

this fine in compensation for losses which Ralph had sustained during the civil war⁷. Giles de Gousle, the custodial sheriff of Lincoln during de Montfort's tenure at the head of the government, was pardoned of £200, in October 1269, which he could not collect from the shire issues because of obstruction by others in the pursuit of his office⁸. William le Latimer, son and heir of William le Latimer, in February 1270, was given a 200m pardon of all accounts, arrears and reckonings for the time his father was the Yorkshire sheriff and holder of other offices⁹. This grant might be connected with the £200 pardon to William le Latimer recorded on the Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll as having been given to William for damages sustained in the king's service¹⁰. In October 1270, John de Muscegros, who had been the Devon sheriff between July 1261 to May 1264, was pardoned all the debts that he owed at the exchequer at the instance of Edward, the king's son¹¹. The final case of a sheriff not being able to fully pursue his shrieval duties due to disturbances concerns Nicholas le Spigurnel, the Norfolk/ Suffolk sheriff for varying periods between Michaelmas 1262 to Hilary 1266. In July 1270, a quittance of £60 was given to his son for Nicholas's losses sustained in not being able to fully exercise his shrieval duties¹². The quite large number of sheriffs being pardoned of their debts

⁷*CLR*, 1267-72, p. 77.

⁸*CLR*, 1267-72, p. 99; E. 372/113, m. 19d.

⁹*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 411.

¹⁰E. 372/111, m. 14d.

¹¹*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 467.

¹²*CLR*, 1267-72, p. 132.

at the exchequer, and the reasons given for these pardons, thus helps to show the disruption to revenue raising activities that the civil war had caused.

The means of accounting for shire issues by the sheriffs for the 1267-70 period was firmly established as being for the basic county farm with a fixed increment above that. There were only a couple of exceptions to this and both were short-lived, these two cases were Lincoln and Kent which were held '*ut custos*' for parts of the financial year Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268. Such a policy of fixed increments was reminiscent of the 1250s and went against the reforming demands of having custodial sheriffs. However, given the low receipts from variable profits above the county farms raised by the previous custodial sheriffs, it is perhaps not surprising that fixed increments became established as the means of raising income above the farm. The table below lists the levels of fixed increments for which the sheriffs were liable during the period Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270:-

Financial Year	Liabe Fixed Increment
Mich. 1267-Mich. 1268	£1624 3s 4d
Mich. 1268-Mich. 1269	£1976 13s 4d
Mich. 1269-Mich. 1270	£1826 13s 4d

The figures noted here refer to the fixed increments assigned to the sheriffs on the pipe rolls. A membrane attached to the October 1267 to October 1268 originalia roll lists the fixed increments given to eighteen sheriffs (the London/ Middlesex, Kent, Worcester and Buckingham/ Bedford sheriffs were

excluded), the total value of which was £1696 1m¹³. It can be assumed that this originalia roll entry was probably drawn up in early 1268 since some of the sheriffs listed started their accounts (as determined by the pipe rolls) in early 1268, whilst the only date mentioned on this membrane is for the 8th February concerning Giles de Gousle accounting for Yorkshire. This helps to explain the difference between the total value of the increments listed on this originalia roll and the total recorded in the table above. Throughout these three years no fixed increment was raised for Buckingham/ Bedford, the county having been held by Edward, the king's son, since 1265.

The level of fixed increments imposed during these years were not as high as those in force prior to the reforms of 1258, although, after Michaelmas 1268, the level was equivalent to those in force between Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262¹⁴. The overwhelming majority of shires, twenty in all, had lower increments in force in the late 1260s as compared to their increment levels of the mid 1250s. Only one shire, Cambridge/ Huntingdon, had the same increment level for both periods, although for the first quarter of the year Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 it had a lower increment which was then subsequently increased to a 60m level after this quarter, this figure being equivalent to that in force prior to 1258. The change

¹³E. 371/32, m. 1, 2.

¹⁴The subsequent analysis excludes London/ Middlesex, Worcester and Lancashire. The former two since their sheriffs never rendered for increments above the farm, and the latter since its accounts are missing for the period after Michaelmas 1262.

in such increments as compared to the Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262 year is more varied. Only seven counties had lower increments in the late 1260s as compared to this earlier year. Four counties - Devon, Yorkshire, Northumberland and Nottingham/ Derby - had higher increments. Eight counties had the same level of increments for the two periods with another one, Norfolk/ Suffolk, having the same level for most of the period from Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270, its increment being reduced during the course of 1270. Salop/ Stafford's case is difficult to determine in that the pipe rolls do not mention the increment value for this county for Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262. If this implies that none was in force, then its £100 increment between Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1269 was higher than that in force in the early 1260s¹⁵. In making these comparisons, the increment level for each shire which was predominantly in force between Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 has been used.

The table listing increment values for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 implies that there were fluctuating levels of increments applied to the counties during these years. However, to a certain extent, this table is misleading. The majority of shires, thirteen in total, retained the same increment throughout these three years. The increase for Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1269 over the previous year is explained mainly through the Lincolnshire and Kent sheriffs rendering parts of the

¹⁵ Presumably, since there was no mention of a fixed increment for this county in the early 1260s, no charge was made against the sheriff at this time for issues above the county farm.

year Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 '*ut custos*' and, in both cases, not raising any variable profits above the basic county farm¹⁶. However, four other shires - Oxford/ Berkshire, Surrey/ Sussex, Cambridge/ Huntingdon and Yorkshire - all had their increments raised after the first quarter of this Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 year, and thus their increment totals for Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1269 were higher than for the former year. The fall for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270, as compared to the previous year, came about since two shires had their increments reduced during 1270, Yorkshire having a lower increment assigned to it for the last quarter of Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 with Norfolk/ Suffolk having a reduced increment assigned to it for the second half of the same year. In addition, the Salop/ Stafford pipe roll account for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 does not record the increment for which the sheriff was liable¹⁷.

Thus, from the above, it would appear that, following the civil war, the increment values applied to the counties were not particularly light, i.e. the levels assigned to the shires were not reduced as compared to those in force between Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262. This possibly suggests that the recovery of shire issues was fairly rapid after the civil war and thus the crown and the exchequer felt that the levels of increments they applied to the shires could be sustained. This suggestion is partly backed up by the actual amount of cash receipts paid into the exchequer

¹⁶The Lincolnshire sheriff rendered '*ut custos*' for the first quarter, the Kent sheriff for the last three quarters.

¹⁷E. 372/117, m. 33d, 36d.

and wardrobe out of shire issues, as shown by the revenue table later in the chapter. Although there is a reduced figure for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270, the receipts from this source for the two years Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1269 do not fall that far short of the equivalent receipts between Michaelmas 1258 to Michaelmas 1261 when shire issue cash receipts into the exchequer and wardrobe were at their highest for the period 1255-1270.

Although liable income from shire issues, i.e. the fixed increment levels, picked up quite quickly following the civil war, royal administration in the shires appears to have been unsettled. J. R. Maddicott, in his article on Edward I and the lessons of baronial reform, suggests that there was discontent in the localities with royal administration after the war. He notes that the Hundred Roll enquiries of 1274-75 show the unpopularity of the post-Evesham sheriffs. In Wiltshire, complaints were heard against the sheriffs William le Dun and Walter Stirchley, whilst all five Norfolk/ Suffolk sheriffs since 1265 were criticised with Robert de Norton, in particular, facing 100 separate charges. Roger de Pridias, appointed Devon sheriff in February 1271, faced complaints about his behaviour which were very reminiscent of those raised against the pre-1258 sheriffs, i.e. not being native to the county, overburdening the county with his hospitality, amercing men at will, false imprisonment to extort money and holding the sheriff's tourn contrary to the county's charter¹⁸. Maddicott also states that although the Statute of Marlborough

¹⁸J. R. Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons of Baronial Reform: Local Government, 1258-80', *Thirteenth Century England I*, p. 7.

perpetuated much of the reformers' work with its restrictions on the lord's right to suit of court, on the sheriff's tourn and on eyre abuses, there were signs that the statute was not widely observed, whilst the post war settlement ignored demands for local sheriffs acting for one year only and serving as custodians¹⁹. It has already been shown that this latter demand was comprehensively ignored after Michaelmas 1267. As for yearly tenure of office, the bulk of the sheriffs between Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 held their offices for over a year, with two sheriffs, James de Paunton for Lincolnshire and Guichard de Charron for Northumberland, serving in office for all three years. Only four shires had frequent changes to their shrieval office during this period. Essex/ Herts had five sheriffs during these three years, whilst Oxford/ Berks, Yorkshire and Surrey/ Sussex each had four sheriffs during this time.

The right to appoint sheriffs appears to have been given up by the king during this period. Henry seems to have granted the keeping of all the shires to his son Edward sometime in the period 1268-69²⁰. The particulars of this grant were not enrolled and so it is difficult to determine what the intention was behind it. Certainly, shrieval appointments had to be sanctioned by Edward. The appointment of Thomas de Boulton to the Lincolnshire shrieval office in October 1270 mentions the *'Acceptance of the commitment by Edward the king's son, to whom the king committed the county of Lincoln and other counties to keep for 5 years.....to Thomas de Boulton of the said*

¹⁹Ibid., p. 5.

²⁰Ibid., p. 7.

*county to keep for that period*²¹. This entry in the *Patent Rolls* was accompanied by a similar entry concerning William Giffard's appointment as Norfolk/ Suffolk sheriff. There are two traces on the pipe rolls of Edward being named as the sheriff of a county but with someone else rendering on his behalf at the exchequer for the shire issues. The clear example is Buckingham/ Bedford which Edward had been holding as sheriff since 1266. Other than this case, the only other example is for the first half of the year Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 for Hereford where Richard del Hoke is recorded as accounting on behalf of Edward²².

However, it is possible that the grant of the counties to Edward might not have been until 1270. The October 1269 to October 1270 originalia roll records a list of offices granted to Edward which includes the appointment of eight sheriffs to answer on Edward's behalf at the exchequer, the dating of which seems to be for May 1270²³. As for the reasons for this grant, it could well have been a means for Edward to raise money to finance his proposed crusade by enabling him to keep any money raised above the fixed increments of the counties, whilst it also gave him a limited degree of control over the country, through his local officials, in his absence and hence security of his succession if Henry died.

Evidence points towards attempts to tighten up royal control over shire administration. The ignoring of the localities' demands over the reform of aspects of the shrieval office and the

²¹*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 470-1.

²²E. 372/114, m. 6d.

²³E. 371/34, m. 2.

grant of the counties to Edward suggest this. Maddicott states that the sheriffs after Evesham were often *curiales* and professional administrators²⁴. Thomas Sancto Vigore, for example, held two separate shrieval offices during this period, being the Oxford/ Berkshire sheriff from Michaelmas 1268 to Easter 1270 and the Somerset/ Dorset sheriff for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270. Giles de Gousle, the Yorkshire sheriff from Hilary 1268 to Easter 1269, had previously been the custodial sheriff for Lincolnshire during de Montfort's tenure in power. John le Moyne, the Northamptonshire sheriff from Michaelmas 1267 to Trinity 1270, was also employed as the king's escheator south of the Trent, whilst William Bagod, the Warwick/ Leicester sheriff for the same period, had been previously employed in this office in the early 1260s as well as having been the custodial sheriff of Salop/ Stafford between Michaelmas 1258 to Christmas 1259. That these men were performing different duties for the crown at the same or varying times suggests that they were professional administrators or, at least, had close contacts with the crown. In addition to these four, there are cases of sheriffs serving between Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 who had previously performed shrieval duties in their counties - John de Bottele for Hampshire, Fulk Peyforer for Kent, Richard de Bathingedon for Hereford and Saer de Frivill for Cambridge/ Huntingdon. With the exception of Saer, these men had acted as custodial sheriffs during 1264-5; Saer having been the Cambridge/ Huntingdon sheriff between Michaelmas 1261 to Michaelmas 1262. The use of great magnates in the shrieval office seems to have been reduced after

²⁴Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons', p. 6.

Michaelmas 1267. Roger de Mortimer ended his tenure as Hereford sheriff at Michaelmas 1267, whilst Roger de Leybourne finished his tenures as Kent and Cumberland sheriffs at Christmas and Michaelmas 1267 respectively. Only Robert Aguillon, holding the Surrey/ Sussex shrieval office during 1268, seems to have been the major *curialis* holding the sheriff's office during this period.

The final point of note concerning royal administration in the shires is that connected with the king's demesne lands. In April 1269, a notice went out to the sheriffs of the counties south of the Trent in which they were charged not to intermeddle with the king's demesnes in their bailiwicks as the king had granted them to John le Moyne, escheator south of the Trent, who was to answer for the issues at the exchequer²⁵. Such a measure appears to have been a policy of decreasing the financial importance of the sheriffs in the localities by reducing the areas of financial issues for which they had to account and seems to have been a resurrection of a similar experiment that Henry had tried to pursue thirty years earlier between 1236 and 1240²⁶. How

²⁵CPR, 1266-72, p. 333.

²⁶R. C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy, and Finance under Henry III 1216-1245* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 73-92. Stacey comments that the council decision in 1236 to entrust the royal demesne to three special *custodes maneriorum* was tied to the desire to increase the returns from this source of revenue. This manifested itself in the belief that '*Maximum returns from the royal demesne could only be guaranteed only if the manors were removed from the sheriffs and other local bailiffs, and handed over to royal officials charged explicitly to maximize these profits.*'

notable this policy was as a means of centralising royal influence and administration in the shires is difficult to say. Henry seems to have been intent on pursuing the policy since, following this April notice, mandates were sent out in May and July to the sheriffs of Devon, Gloucester, Salop/ Stafford, Worcester and Norfolk/ Suffolk re-iterating the command not to intermeddle in the king's demesnes in their bailiwicks²⁷. Such a policy might have been introduced for administrative reasons, i.e. it was easier to audit one account for all the demesne lands as opposed to having several different bailiffs accounting for them.

Turning to shrieval attendance at both the exchequers of receipt and audit, an improvement can be seen in such attendance for the years Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 as compared to the civil war years. However, the numbers of sheriffs attending both exchequers and also making proffers still falls short of the numbers from before the civil war. The table below lists attendance at the exchequer of audit for this period:

Financial Year	Pipe Roll	Memoranda Roll
Mich. 67-Mich. 68	14	13
Mich. 68-Mich. 69	11	7
Mich. 69-Mich. 70	14	13

Again, as for the civil war years, there is a difference here between the totals listed here and those listed by M. H. Mills. She counts 15 pipe roll audits for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas

²⁷*CPR*, 1266-72, pp. 337, 350.

1268 and 10 for the following year²⁸. Similarly, the number of accounts mentioned on the memoranda rolls differs from the number recorded on the pipe rolls. In all three years, the London/ Middlesex account is recorded on the pipe rolls but not on any of the memoranda rolls. The other counties with accounts missing from the memoranda rolls are Warwick/ Leicester for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 and Cumberland, Northumberland and Gloucester for Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1269. As mentioned in previous chapter, there is a county account entry for Worcester on the memoranda roll Michaelmas 1268 to Trinity 1269 but no equivalent account on the pipe roll Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268. It can only be assumed that these absences from the memoranda rolls were either administrative oversights or the result of lost membranes.

As for attendance at the exchequer of receipt to make proffers, the number of sheriffs making such payments for the *Adventus Vicecomitum* and the total received from the two yearly *Adventi* increases year by year for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 as shown by the table below:-

Term	Numbers Attending	Numbers Paying Money	Proffer	Totals
Mich. 1267	21	13	£353	
Easter 1268	20	13	£433	13s 4d
Mich. 1268	17	7	£138	
Easter 1269	22	15	£891	15s 4d

²⁸M. H. Mills, “*Adventus Vicecomitum*”, p. 488.

Mich. 1269	21	13	£370	13s 4d
Easter 1270	20	16	£1005	13s 4d
Mich. 1270	20	15	£635	6s 8d

The Easter 1270 *Adventus* also records the attendance of a representative of the Westmorland sheriff, who paid 5.5m into the exchequer for summonses²⁹. This attendance and the sum paid in have been excluded from the above tables since this is the only term for 1255-1270 in which Westmorland was included in the *Adventus Vicecomitum*. On a yearly basis, the *Adventus* totals for receipts work out as follows:-

Financial Year	Proffer Total
Mich. 67-Mich. 68	£571 13s 4d
Mich. 68-Mich. 69	£1262 8s 8d
Mich. 69-Mich. 70	£1641

The totals for Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1270 show an increase over the years of the civil war but still fall short of the yearly totals brought into the exchequer by the *Adventus Vicecomitum* for the years prior to the civil war. It was not until the mid 1270s that the yearly proffers generated as much in receipts as the 1250s³⁰. It must be noted here, as was the case for the civil war years, that the figures drawn up in the above table

²⁹E. 159/44, m. 21d.

³⁰Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", p. 494.

differ from those recorded by M. H. Mills and E. F. Jacob³¹. For each of the years Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1270, the table above records lower totals than those given by Mills and Jacob, only the total for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 coincides with their figures. The total for Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1269 differs by £77, a figure which Jacob, in his county *Adventus* tables, includes as part of the Cumberland sheriff's Michaelmas 1269 proffer³². The *Adventus* for this term states that 40m was paid by the Cumberland sheriff and then in the right hand margin it states '*per brevia* £77' ³³. Presumably, it is this £77 that Mills and Jacob included in their tables. Yet a similar entry in the same term for Oxford/Berkshire, for £86 17s 10d, was not included by the two of them in their totals. The biggest discrepancy comes for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270. For three counties for this year - Buckingham/ Bedford, Hampshire and London/ Middlesex - the above table records higher proffer payments, all of which result from the Easter 1270 term, Mills and Jacob not recording the £7 paid by the Middlesex sheriff, 43s paid by the Buckingham/ Bedford sheriff for Jewish debts, and coming up with a figure £2 lower for Hampshire³⁴. In contrast, three other counties are given higher figures by Mills and Jacob. They record £430 for the Norfolk/ Suffolk proffers, as opposed to a figure of £30 used in the above table, an additional £33 6s 8d for

³¹M. H. Mills, "Adventus Vicecomitum", p. 494; E. F. Jacob, *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67* (Oxford 1925), p. 248-49.

³²Jacob, *Studies in the Period*, p. 248-9.

³³E. 159/44, m. 21.

³⁴E. 159/44, m. 21d.

Lincolnshire and an extra £10 for Oxford/ Berkshire. That leaves an extra 50m included in their totals which I cannot account for.

That the *Adventus* totals for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 do not approach the equivalent figures for the 1250s partly illustrates how slow the period of financial recovery was after the civil war. To this extent they mirror the receipts into the exchequer and wardrobe as audited on the pipe rolls, which show similar depressed totals as compared to the 1250s. It is not difficult to canvas reasons why the *Adventus* receipts did not return quickly to the levels of the 1250s. The levels of fixed increments above the county farm were lower in the late 1260s than those in force during the mid 1250s and therefore sheriffs had to account for lower shire issues. Receipts from the general eyre, visitations of which resumed in 1268, were similarly depressed from the equivalent levels of the 1250s. Alongside this, the cash payments by the sheriffs, for whatever category of revenue, into the exchequer were depressed through the number of allowances given to them for expenditure at a local level resulting from the civil war. The struggle that sheriffs were having in raising cash would explain why, at each term, a sizeable number of sheriffs were recorded as not paying any money into the exchequer for their proffer. It is only in one case, that of the Yorkshire sheriff at the Easter 1268 *Adventus*, that a reason is given for his non-payment of a proffer. This states that he came to the exchequer and '*nichil tulit quia parum recepit*'³⁵, suggesting that he did not receive enough from his county's issues to make a

³⁵E. 368/42, m. 28.

proffer. The Northumberland sheriff was excused attendance at the Michaelmas 1268 exchequer³⁶.

The Exchequer was, however, slowly reasserting its authority during the years Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270. Inquiries into shrieval behaviour and administration from before the civil war were launched during these years. There were the orders to sheriffs to investigate the impeding of former sheriffs in the pursuit of their duties (as mentioned in the 1258-61 chapter)³⁷. There were also moves towards clearing up outstanding shrieval account arrears, i.e. those of James de Audley from his tenure as the Salop/ Stafford sheriff in 1261-63 or those relating to John Lovel's tenures as the Cambridge/ Huntingdon sheriff between 1261 to 1264³⁸. The sorting out of salary allowances to custodial sheriffs, which had started after Evesham, continued. William de Engelby, Robert de Mescy and John de Plessetis, all custodial sheriffs from 1258-59 were noted in the memoranda rolls as being allowed salary allowances for the keeping of their counties³⁹.

This process of recovery in the efficiency and effectiveness of the exchequer to its pre-civil war standard was a slow one, and had still not been completed by Michaelmas 1270. As has been shown, by that date only the level of fixed increments had recovered to the levels of 1261-62. Attendance at the exchequer of audit was low, and although the numbers of sheriffs

³⁶E. 368/43, m. 28.

³⁷E. 368/42, m. 11; E. 159/44, m. 6.

³⁸E. 368/42, mm. 10d, 11.

³⁹E. 368/42, m. 9d; E. 159/44, mm. 6d, 7.

(or their representatives) attending the proffers was nearly back to the levels of the 1250s, the sums brought in by the proffers were much lower, though they were gradually increasing in value over this period. The improvement in exchequer administration and control over the shires still had a long way to go by Michaelmas 1270.

Revenue

Both the adjusted cash income and total notional income figures for the two years Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1269 appear, on average, to be just beneath the level of the two years after the Battle of Evesham (Michaelmas 1265 to Michaelmas 1267), with both categories then falling for the subsequent Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 year. The totals on the actual revenue table are fairly constant for all three years. Therefore, it is difficult to distinguish any trends for overall income over this period other than income was still beneath the levels of before the civil war. This thus suggests that the recovery of the crown's finances was taking some time.

The tables below list both the adjusted and actual revenue tables for the three years Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270:-

Adjusted Revenue Table

	Mich. 1267-8	Mich. 1268-9	Mich. 1269-70
<u>Shire Accounts</u>			
Shire Issues	£1456	£1363	£898
Demesne	£2855	£1889	£1691
Judicial	£1314	£2428	£1084

Debts	£1449	£1381	£857
Jews	£13	£42	£21
Feudal	£212	£91	£44
Taxation	£590	£552	£128
Forest	£112	£128	£91
Miscellaneous	£246	£10	£5
TOTAL	£8247	£7884	£4814
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>			
Eccl. Vacancies	£678	-	-
Demesne	£76	£55	£69
Forest	-	-	-
Mint/Exchange	£435	£435	£54
Miscellaneous	£123	£90	£52
Escheats/Seisins	£327	£128	£128
TOTAL	£1639	£708	£303
TOTAL (Shire and Foreign)	£9886	£8592	£5117
Misc. Cash	-	£60	-
Wardrobe Cash	£3879	£5050	£4870
TOTAL CASH	£13,765	£13,702	£9987
CREDITS	£9564	£10, 874	£9934
TOTAL NOTIONAL INCOME	£23,329	£24,576	£19,921

Actual Revenue Table

	Mich. 1267-8	Mich. 1268-9	Mich. 1269-70
<u>Shire Accounts</u>			
Shire Issues	£978	£1494	£1094
Demesne	£2787	£1807	£2291

Judicial	£974	£2139	£1786
Debts	£1127	£1825	£721
Jews	£9	£38	£28
Feudal	£226	£86	£84
Taxation	£242	£826	£242
Forest	£49	£84	£175
Miscellaneous	£260	£10	£37
TOTAL	£6652	£8309	£6458
<u>Foreign Accounts</u>			
Eccl. Vacancies	£1166	-	-
Demesne	£250	-	£57
Forest	-	-	-
Mint/Exchange	-	-	£1469
Miscellaneous	£67	£474	-
Escheats/Seisins	£461	£26	£244
TOTAL	£1944	£500	£1770
TOTAL (Shire and Foreign)	£8596	£8809	£8228
Misc. Cash	-	£702	-
Wardrobe Cash	£3879	£5050	£4870
TOTAL CASH	£12,475	£14,561	£13,098
CREDITS	£9556	£10, 498	£11, 588
TOTAL NOTIONAL INCOME	£22,031	£25,059	£24,686

The figures in the tables above ignore expenditure credits from the issues of two miscellaneous sources of revenue, these being the ecclesiastical tenth and the dues from Llywelyn ap Gruffydd, the details of which are noted later in the chapter. These

sources of revenue were not accounted for on the pipe rolls, instead references to expenditure out of these receipts are contained in the *Patent Rolls*. It cannot be determined exactly what the value of these resources were to the crown during this period, but a rough estimate of the annual value of the credits from these issues would give around about £14,000 a year for this period⁴⁰. This would therefore give total notional income figures for Michaelmas 1267-70 in the region of £36,000 to £39,000.

Income from demesne issues seems to have risen initially between Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 as compared to the civil war years, and then, after Michaelmas 1268, to have fallen down to a lower level. This fall cannot be solely explained in terms of distortions caused by the problem of pipe roll audits since both the adjusted and actual revenue tables both record this fall. The one receipt roll for this period, that of Easter 1269, also records a very low total for receipts clearly labelled as belonging to the demesne category. This demesne total has been calculated to be £686 6s 3. 5d⁴¹, a sum which falls along way short of any demesne receipt totals for any of the termly receipt rolls surviving for the years prior to Michaelmas 1262. However, it is more than probable that the sheriffs, in their payments into the exchequer during this term, were also paying in money from demesne issues, though it cannot be worked out from their payments what share came from this source. But, as has been mentioned earlier, with the command for demesne lands south of the Trent to be placed under the keepership of John le Moyne, it is

⁴⁰Based on figures given later in the chapter.

⁴¹E. 401/46

likely that the share of demesne issues in the shrieval lump sum payments into the exchequer was minimal.

Although part of the reason for the low level of demesne receipts lies with the after effects of the civil war and the allowances given to boroughs and cities in their farms at the exchequer as compensation for damages/ losses and expenses sustained during the civil war, the dominant reason lies elsewhere. What appears to have happened is that the crown, after Michaelmas 1268, could not call upon the issues of several demesne lands, hence depressing receipts from this source. Henry's grant of Lancaster to his son Edmund meant that the revenue of the farms of that county were no longer available to the crown⁴². However, it was Henry's grant of lands to his wife in January 1269 that contributed the most to the fall in demesne revenue after Michaelmas 1268. Peter of Savoy had, before his death, bequeathed to Queen Eleanor the honour of Richmond. Eleanor surrendered and quitclaimed this honour to the king so that Henry could grant it to John of Brittany. In exchange, Henry granted the Queen 800m yearly for life, to be received from the farm of 17 manors and boroughs⁴³, though, in the following year in June 1270, the manors and boroughs from which she drew these 800m were changed⁴⁴. It appears that some of the receipts of these farms granted to Eleanor initially passed through the exchequer since there are two *liberate* writs for November 1269 ordering payment of two of the farms, Boreham and Wycombe, to

⁴²*CChR*, 1257-1300, p. 78.

⁴³*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 310-11; E. 368/43, m. 6.

⁴⁴*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 433-4.

her⁴⁵. In addition to this land granted to the Queen, Edward's wife, Eleanor, was also receiving grants of manors. The *Patent Rolls*, for January 1268 record this Eleanor as having been given the manors of Boudon, Harborough, Thorpe and Asseford to hold for ten years for her maintenance⁴⁶. Further grants to her are recorded on the *Charter Rolls* for May 1270, where the additional manors of Somerton, Pitney, Wearne and Aylesham and the hundreds of Somerton, Spelho and Gartree were assigned to her. All these grants came with the statement that '*the said lands are not to be separated from the crown of England*'⁴⁷. This proviso showed that the king was not prepared to give away land in perpetuity. However, that land had been alienated from the royal demesne is clear in that within two months of Edward's coronation as king, he had ordered his escheators to repossess all lands wrongfully alienated from the royal demesne since the civil war⁴⁸.

Despite the resumption of the general eyre during the course of 1268, judicial receipts into the exchequer and wardrobe fell short of the equivalent receipts during the 1250s. Sixteen counties (including Cornwall) were visited before Michaelmas 1270. The Lincolnshire eyre planned for 1269 under Gilbert Preston had its initial summons revoked following complaints to the king from the county that seven years had not elapsed since the completion of the previous visitation of the eyre there in

⁴⁵CLR, 1267-72, pp. 102, 104.

⁴⁶CPR, 1266-72, p. 179.

⁴⁷CChR, 1257-1300, p. 143.

⁴⁸Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons', p. 10.

1263. This proposed eyre was thus postponed until 1271-72 instead⁴⁹.

Part of the reason for the low judicial receipts of cash lies with the allowances made against the eyre and judicial revenues by the king for debts that he owed to other people. In May 1268, the king ordered that the citizens of York should receive the £760, which the king owed them for purchases they paid for on the king's behalf at the fair of St. Ives, out of the Yorkshire eyre amercements⁵⁰. The same month, justices on eyre in Essex/ Herts were ordered to pay Alan la Zuche £446 7s 7d, for his keeping of the Tower of London, and £146 17s 7. 5d to William la Zuche, for his keeping of the Isle of Ely, out of the eyre issues⁵¹. Edmund, the king's son, was granted, in July 1268, the receipts of the amercements of the tenants of his lands before the king's justices⁵². Edmund was also granted, in September 1268, the receipts of knighthood respite fines levied in Lincolnshire⁵³. His brother, Edward was granted the fines and amercements of the hundred of Odiham⁵⁴. Adam de Gesemuth was paid the £394 2s 4. 5d, which the king owed him for debts from the time when Adam was sheriff of Northumberland and constable of Newcastle castle,

⁴⁹Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons', p. 8; D. Crook, *Records of the General Eyre* (PRO Handbooks number 20), p. 134, 139.

⁵⁰CPR, 1266-72, p. 229.

⁵¹CPR, 1266-72, p. 230.

⁵²CPR, 1266-72, p. 245.

⁵³CPR, 1266-72, p. 260.

⁵⁴CPR, 1266-72, p. 265.

out of the receipts of the Northumberland eyre⁵⁵. In August 1269, the sheriffs of Norfolk and Yorkshire were mentioned as having been ordered to pay 2687.5m out of the eyre issues to Richard of Cornwall for money he lent the king, of which only £140 had been paid by them, and thus, as a result, Richard was granted the residue out of the next eyre in Devon⁵⁶. The Devon pipe roll account for this eyre records Richard as receiving £281 out of the eyre issues⁵⁷. The failure to cover this debt to Richard from these eyres suggests that a low figure for monetary receipts from amercements was occurring, a symptom of the general depressed financial state of the country.

Feudal receipts to the crown appear to have remained low for this period, though initially, for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268, the foreign account total for escheats records a high for the period 1255-1270. The number of fines made for feudal rights worth over 50m are low. Neither the originalia rolls nor the fine rolls record any such fines at all between October 1267 to October 1269. The three fines recorded for these two years are on the *Patent Rolls*. In February 1268, John Stomy, for a 100m fine, was granted the wardship of the lands and heirs of John de Wik, though this 100m fine was paid over, on the king's command, to John of Brittany⁵⁸. In February 1269, John de Chishull was granted the wardship of the lands and heirs of John de Berneswell with the 50m fine he made for this wardship being

⁵⁵*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 257-8; E. 372/115, m. 35d.

⁵⁶*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 364.

⁵⁷E. 372/116, m. 31d.

⁵⁸*CPR*, 1266-1272, pp. 190, 218.

paid over to the keepers of the works at Westminster⁵⁹. In July 1269, Geoffrey de Gacelin made a 200m fine for the wardship of the lands and heirs of Walter de Wahull⁶⁰. For 1269-1270, the situation improves. In July 1270, Richard de Ewell bought the wardship of the lands and heirs of Henry de Merc for 100m and 2m gold⁶¹. Philip Basset made a 500m fine for the wardship of the lands of William de Montacute⁶², of which he paid 300m over to Poncius de la More to pay for royal wine purchases⁶³. Also recorded are payments of £400 and 50m by Hawise, late the wife of Patrick de Cadurcis, and 355m 10s 4d by Alice de Lacy to the Westminster works as part of the fines that they had previously made for the wardships of their respective husband's lands⁶⁴, whilst, in February 1270, John de Mandeville was acknowledged as having paid £100 for his relief to Richard de Monet⁶⁵. Of the above cases, only Richard de Ewell paid cash to the king, his 100m fine being ordered to be paid into the wardrobe.

The low receipts from these feudal sources of revenue stem from Henry having granted many of these rights away. As noted in the previous chapter, back in June 1266, Henry had

⁵⁹*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 318-9.

⁶⁰*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 354, 356.

⁶¹E. 371/34, m. 1; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 437.

⁶²E. 371/34, m. 2; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 467.

⁶³*CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 469, 470.

⁶⁴*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 412, 468, 470. It is possible that the sum mentioned for Alice de Lacy is incorrect in that her normal yearly payment of her fine to the Westminster works was £355 10s 4d.

⁶⁵*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 409.

granted to John of Brittany, as he was bound to him for 4000m, the issues and profits of the escheats, wardships and marriage rights that fell to the crown with the promise that no other charge should be levied on these rights until John had received this sum⁶⁶. This grant not only depressed the receipts from feudal revenue but also created a backlog as regards the grants of feudal rights to others. Thus many of the king's grants to people of money from wardships were subject to the proviso that the king had to satisfy John of Brittany of his dues first. For example, in November 1267, William de Say was granted £100 yearly of land out of the first wards that fell in '*so soon as the king's son John de Britannia be satisfied of the said 4000m*'⁶⁷. In addition to cases like this, income raised from wardship fines was directed straight to John of Brittany and not to the exchequer. For example, Guichard de Charon, in March 1268, was recorded as paying 100m, in full payment of his 500m fine for the wardship of the lands and heirs of Thomas son of Michael, to John of Brittany⁶⁸. (This fine initially having been made prior to this period). Guichard had previously, in December 1267, paid over 400m for this wardship to John⁶⁹. In addition to the above grants, Henry had also promised wardships to his brother, a *Patent Rolls* entry for February 1268 noting that the king had '*heretofore granted that he would provide for his brother, Richard, king of Almain, in*

⁶⁶CPR, 1258-66, p. 668.

⁶⁷CPR, 1266-72, p. 168.

⁶⁸CPR, 1266-72, p. 202.

⁶⁹CPR, 1266-72, p. 178.

*£1000 yearly of lands out of wards*⁷⁰. Richard had received nothing by this date, and the king promised to him that he would provide *'for no other person until his brother be satisfied'*⁷¹. Richard had received the wardship of the lands and heirs of Roger de Mowbray, but a decision was yet to be made about whether this wardship was to be included as part of the £1000 yearly grant.

From the Spring of 1269, the *Patent Rolls* start to record grants of wardships to leading magnates other than to John of Brittany. In June 1269, Robert de Aguillon received the wardship of the lands and heirs of Richard de Plaiz in part satisfaction of £200 yearly of land that the king had granted him⁷². In July 1269, Richard, the king's brother, received the wardships of two parts of the lands late of Henry de Hastings⁷³. In October 1269, the Queen was granted the wardship of the lands and heirs of Reynold de Layham⁷⁴. The following year, in May 1270, Edmund, the king's son, was recorded as having been given the wardship of the lands and heirs of Thomas de Grelle⁷⁵. In June 1270, Robert Charles was granted 400m out of the first feudal rights that fell in⁷⁶, whilst in July 1270, Roger de Clifford was granted the first wardship worth £500 a year falling in, with the

⁷⁰CPR, 1266-72, p. 187.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 187.

⁷²CPR, 1266-72, p. 348.

⁷³CPR, 1266-72, p. 360.

⁷⁴CPR, 1266-72, p. 372.

⁷⁵CPR, 1266-72, p. 425.

⁷⁶CPR, 1266-72, p. 434-5.

proviso, of the king's special grace, that if such a wardship was worth an additional £200 a year (i.e. worth up to £700 a year), he was entitled to that extra amount⁷⁷.

Whilst the above mentioned wardship grants account for the low figures for feudal revenue, the king did not make full use of the escheats pertaining to the crown after the civil war. The revenues of many such escheats were granted out to people in addition to the above mentioned grant to John of Brittany. The *Patent Rolls*, for December 1267, record a mention of Henry's grant to John Comyn of £300 yearly of land which the king could 'give away by reason of the disturbance had in the realm'⁷⁸. The long standing promise of the king to provide for William de Valence in £500 yearly of land entailed William receiving escheats pertaining to the crown, having by February 1268 received £280 7s 1d worth of escheats⁷⁹. Two years later, in July 1270, the *Patent Rolls* record the king as having granted further manors to William out of royal escheats. The debts pertaining to these manors owed by the previous owners were nullified so that William was not liable for them⁸⁰. Roger de Leybourne was assigned the goods and lands of John de Watton in March 1268⁸¹. As mentioned before, the honour of Richmond was granted to John of Brittany at great financial cost to the king⁸². Edmund, the king's

⁷⁷*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 448.

⁷⁸*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 175.

⁷⁹*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 193-4.

⁸⁰*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 449.

⁸¹*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 214.

⁸²*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 310-11.

son, in the Spring of 1269 was granted the lands of Simon de Montfort⁸³, whilst, in May 1269, William de Sancta Ermina was promised £100 yearly of escheats falling in, having previously been granted this amount at the siege of Kenilworth but had received nothing⁸⁴.

From the above it seems that revenue received from the issues of land, whether it was through demesne issues, wardships or escheats, was fairly low. The civil war could have provided the king with the chance to replenish the crown demesne. However, it appears that this chance was not taken as patronage demands resulted in the king having to grant away many of the feudal rights coming the crown's way⁸⁵. That this happened might possibly suggest that the crown's political strength was not that great, i.e. Henry felt obliged to grant out so much patronage to ensure support for his regime. The magnates supporting Henry during the civil war would have expected a share of the spoils of victory, and to have let them down could have created political problems for the king. Gloucester's uprising in 1267, as mentioned in the last chapter, shows this point. Some patronage Henry was certainly obliged to carry out. For example, his son Edmund had to be provided with a landed estate, which was duly carried out through Edmund's receipt of Lancaster and

⁸³*CChR*, 1257-1300, p. 118; *CPR*, 1266-72, p. 339.

⁸⁴*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 338.

⁸⁵C. H. Knowles, 'The Resettlement of England After the Barons War, 1264-67', *TRHS*, xxxii (1982), pp. 25-41. Knowles analyses the distribution and receipt of lands of de Montfort's supporters following their defeat in the civil war.

Simon de Montfort's lands. In certain respects, Henry's situation after the civil war was not that unsimilar to his position in the mid 1250s in that patronage demands were reducing his potential cash income whilst also creating a backlog of grants to be honoured.

The biggest financial resource available to the crown during this period was the tenth on ecclesiastical revenues. Henry had in March 1266 dispatched William de Chavent and William Bonquer to ask the papacy for a grant of taxation '*for the relief and amelioration of the estate of the king and the realm*'⁸⁶. The pope, in reply, had granted him a tenth of ecclesiastical revenues for three years, the collection of which began in January 1267⁸⁷. W. E. Lunt, in his book on the financial relations between England and the papacy up to 1327, estimates the yield produced by this tenth as '*probably somewhere between £44,000 and £49,000*', stating that the receipts are not entered in the surviving records from the exchequer and wardrobe and with the entries in the *Patent Rolls* not being complete⁸⁸. The bulk of this total was not paid directly to the king, instead being used by Henry to pay off outstanding debts owed by him. These debt repayments essentially consisted of covering outstanding fee arrears, paying for purchases/ munitions and expenses associated with the civil war, and the repayment of loans taken out by the king. The pope

⁸⁶CPR, 1258-66, p. 566-7.

⁸⁷W. E. Lunt, *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327* (Cambridge Massachusetts, 1939), p. 292-93; CChR, 1257-1300, p. 62-3; *Chronica Johannis de Oxenides*, ed. H. Ellis, Rolls Series (London, 1859), pp. 232-233.

⁸⁸Lunt, *Financial Relations*, p. 309.

had established as priority payments from the proceeds of the tenth, the arrears of the yearly cess owed to him by the king and 60,000 pounds of Tours (worth around £15,000 sterling) which had been granted to the Queen for the repayment of her debts⁸⁹. The arrears of the papal cess that had to be paid were 7000m⁹⁰, and this sum was to be met through the receipts from the tenth in Ireland and from the bishoprics of Norwich and Lincoln, with the Queen's dues to be met from the York, Exeter and Llandaff dioceses and the remainder of the Irish tenth (the initial charge had been made upon the tenth of Scotland but had to be cancelled when the Scottish king refused to allow the tenth to be levied from his clergy)⁹¹. The cash revenue that Henry received from this tax was paid into the wardrobe. The *Patent Rolls*, between May 1267 to October 1270, record the receipts of £7423 19s 9.5d into the wardrobe from the tenth. This figure excludes the sums from entries where money was delivered to the buyers of the wardrobe for purchases or was delivered to the treasurer to carry out expenditure authorised by the king. The wardrobe accounts themselves state that £11,121 5. 5d was received from this tenth⁹². Therefore, taking Lunt's figures for the total receipts of this tax, around £33,000 to £38,000 of the tenth was used to cover the various debts which the king owed.

The other large financial resource available to the king at this time resulted from the peace between the king and the

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 295; *CPR*, 1266-72, p. 91.

⁹⁰*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 91.

⁹¹Lunt, *Financial Relations*, p. 296.

⁹²E. 372/115, m. 2; E. 372/116, m. 1.

Welsh prince Llywelyn ap Gruffydd. By the Treaty of Montgomery of 1267, Llywelyn was acknowledged as prince of Wales by Henry. The Welsh barons were to hold their lands as fiefs from Llywelyn, and many of Llywelyn's territorial gains were accepted. In exchange, Llywelyn accepted that he owed fealty and homage to Henry and agreed to pay 25,000m to the English king. A further 5000m was added to this sum in 1270 when Henry conceded feudal lordship for lands in South Wales to Llywelyn⁹³. Payments were set at 3000m a year⁹⁴, though the *Patent Rolls* seem to indicate that this rate of payment was not always the case between Christmas 1267 to Christmas 1270. 5000m seems to have been paid by Llywelyn to the king's envoys in October and December 1267⁹⁵ and 3000m at Christmas 1268⁹⁶. In November 1269, the *Patent Rolls* refer to £3000 being due from Llywelyn at Christmas 1270⁹⁷. This is probably meant to refer to Christmas 1269, and not Christmas 1270, and the sum mentioned could be a mistake. A further 3000m was mentioned, in July 1270, as being due at Christmas 1270⁹⁸. In the meantime, Llywelyn, in August 1270, paid 5000m in return for the homage and lordship of Mereduc son of Rhys⁹⁹. The majority of the money paid over by Llywelyn was assigned by the king to others. Edward, the king's

⁹³M. Prestwich, *Edward I* (London, 1988), pp. 170, 173.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 173.

⁹⁵*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 123, 175

⁹⁶*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 307.

⁹⁷*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 397.

⁹⁸*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 436.

⁹⁹*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 457.

son, received 9000m (including the whole of the 5000m paid in August 1270) for expenses that he had incurred, these expenses having consisted of money he had delivered on the king's behalf to Gaston de Bearn and for his proposed crusade¹⁰⁰. 500m was made over to William de Calviniaco for arrears of his fee, 1324m to John of Brittany for arrears of 200m a year which he was accustomed to receive at the exchequer, £100 to Guy de Lusignan (probably for fee arrears though the reason is not stated), and £1000 to Roger de Leybourne in part payment of £3094 10s 1. 5d which Henry owed to Roger for his expenses in the king's service¹⁰¹.

As for other income, the revenue tables drawn up do not point to any notable rises in the other categories. The miscellaneous cash figure for 1268-69 stems mainly from £642 noted in the Easter 1269 receipt roll as having been paid into the lower exchequer from Jews for a respite from tallage¹⁰². However, the foreign accounts show, on average, rather depressed receipts for these three years. The income from ecclesiastical vacancies, which was usually the largest contribution to foreign account receipts, is in particular very low. The pipe rolls only have accounts for vacancies in the Worcester and Winchester bishoprics for parts of the Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 financial year¹⁰³, although the pipe roll for this year also records the accounts for vacancies at Chichester and Salisbury from the years

¹⁰⁰*CPR*, 1266-72, pp. 175, 299, 302, 436, 457.

¹⁰¹*CPR*, 1266-72, pp. 370-1, 391, 397, 398.

¹⁰²E. 401/46.

¹⁰³E. 372/112, m. 3, 4d.

1262 and 1263¹⁰⁴. Again, as in previous years, it appears that accounts for vacant bishoprics are missing from the pipe rolls. The Easter 1269 receipt roll records £60 as having been paid into the exchequer in April of that year from vacancies at the bishoprics of Hereford and Salisbury¹⁰⁵. The Hereford bishopric appears to have become vacant at the end of 1268 as the *Patent Rolls* for December 1268 record the king as having been notified of its vacancy and appointing Reynold de Acle to the keepership of this bishopric¹⁰⁶. In March 1268, the *Patent Rolls* record a notification that Richard de Stanes, guardian of the bishopric of London, delivered £316 1m out of the issues of the bishopric, on the king's order, to three men for various expenses and debt repayment¹⁰⁷, whilst, for August 1269, the king is recorded as having received £100 from the guardian of the Chichester bishopric '*for urgent business*'¹⁰⁸. However, it is not clear whether this signifies a vacancy at Chichester or not since this entry on the *Patent Rolls* goes on to state that the king will repay this sum to the guardians '*and to keep them harmless touching this sum of money towards the pope and the court of Rome and others*'¹⁰⁹. Since there is no mention on the pipe rolls of Henry's reign of vacancies at Hereford, Salisbury, London or Chichester, it could well be that the

¹⁰⁴E. 372/112, m. 2d.

¹⁰⁵E. 401/46, m. 9. This has been placed in the miscellaneous cash section of the 1268-69 financial year.

¹⁰⁶CPR, 1266-72, p. 305.

¹⁰⁷CPR, 1266-72, p. 211.

¹⁰⁸CPR, 1266-72, p. 361.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 361.

accounts of the keepers were not audited at the exchequer until Edward's reign and thus are not recorded until then.

As usual, there are a number of fines made by priories and abbeys for the keeping of the issues of their houses during vacancies caused by the death of the head of their houses. The *Patent Rolls* record 15 such fines between October 1267 to October 1270, totalling 695m. All but three of these fines were recorded in the originalia rolls as well. The largest of these fines was for 300m, made by the prior and convent of Ramsay for the keeping of their house during its '*present voidance*' in February 1268¹¹⁰, this sum being paid into the wardrobe¹¹¹. The only other large fine was for 100m which the Prior and convent of St. Benet's, Holme, made for the voidance of their house in August 1268¹¹². The remaining thirteen fines were for sums of 60m or less. There is perhaps a suggestion of Henry selling custody rights for abbeys before they became vacant since six of these fines were made for the keeping of abbeys when they next fell vacant¹¹³. However, these fines only total 160m which probably reflects that there was no concerted policy of selling vacancy rights before they arose.

If the proceeds of the ecclesiastical tenth and the payments from Llywelyn are included in the totals, then the average total notional income for the crown for the period Michaelmas 1267-70 was higher than that for any of the other

¹¹⁰E. 371/32, m. 11; *CPR*, 1266-72, p. 196.

¹¹¹*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 200.

¹¹²*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 253.

¹¹³*CPR*, 1266-72, pp. 163, 323, 349, 389, 459, 460; E. 371/32, m. 11; E. 371/34, m.

1.

periods covered by this thesis. However, this would paint a misleading picture of the recovery in finance for these years. The proceeds from the tenth and from Llywelyn can be termed as 'extraordinary' revenue, i.e. revenue that the king could not normally call upon every year. Hence, if these two areas are excluded, then the king's financial situation as regards income is not so favourable. The figures for his total notional income had not quite returned to the levels of the 1255-62 financial years, whilst the totals for cash receipts were still a long way short of those for the earlier period. As with the exchequer administration, a complete recovery in the king's income from the issues of the shire and foreign accounts was still to be completed by Michaelmas 1270.

Expenditure

The table below lists expenditure out of the exchequer by category for Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 and the actual pipe roll credits for these years:-

	Liberate Writ Totals		
	Mich.1267-68	Mich. 1268-69	Mich.1269-70
Alms	-	£5	£17
Wages/Maintenance	£170	£363	£162
Gift	£249	£471	£34
Building Works	£45	£12	£69
Purchases/Munitions	£1431	£4299	£3936
Fee	£1605	£2044	£690
Admin. /Expenses	£263	£571	£351
Miscellaneous	£337	£1483	£459

Wardrobe	£904	£1739	£3365
TOTAL	£5004	£10,987	£9083

Pipe Roll Credits

	Mich.1267-68	Mich. 1268-69	Mich.1269-70
Alms	£204	£129	£227
Wages/Maintenance	£3415	£2702	£3572
Gift	£523	£446	£426
Building Works	£862	£3003	£1431
Purchases/Munitions	£1674	£1208	£3065
Pardon	£1488	£887	£477
Fee	£158	£513	£120
Miscellaneous	£854	£1394	£2038
Admin. /Expenses	£378	£216	£232
TOTAL	£9556	£10,498	£11,588

The three *Liberate Rolls* for the years 1267-70 suggest that expenditure out of the exchequer increased as compared to the years 1265-67. The *Liberate Roll* for the regnal year 52 Henry III (October 1267 to October 1268) is partly damaged in places and therefore not all the entries are readable. Thus the figures recorded above for the year Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 reflect only those entries that are clearly legible. The levels of authorised expenditure out of the exchequer for Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1270 are above the cash income figures (exclusive of miscellaneous wardrobe receipts) noted in the revenue table for these two years. Therefore, unless the lower exchequer was receiving a lot of money that was not being audited

on the pipe rolls, it would suggest that not all of these *liberate* writs were being honoured at the exchequer.

It is in the category of fee payments that one sees the most notable changes. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the king and his council, in October 1267, had introduced a policy of controlling and reducing fee payments by prohibiting fees to anyone save those '*attendant on the king's business in divers bailiwicks*'¹¹⁴. This policy was put into practice in the years after Michaelmas 1267, though initially it resulted in an increase in the value of authorised *liberate* writs concerning the payment of fees for the two years after this date. This increase stemmed from both the means which the crown used in order to get the recipients of fees to agree to giving up their claims for future fee payments and also from having to cover the payments of overdue fees stemming from non-payment in the years prior to Michaelmas 1267. For example, the majority of the authorised fee payments out of the exchequer for Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1269 stem from one writ, issued in March 1269, ordering £2000 to be paid to Edward, the king's son¹¹⁵. Edward had paid this sum on the king's behalf to the count of Bigorre for fee arrears and the release of his fee at the exchequer¹¹⁶. Similarly, in the same year, in February 1269, a 300m *liberate* writ was issued to Emery de Rupe Canardi

¹¹⁴ *CLR*, 1260-67, p. 298. A further note about this decree is mentioned in March 1269 when Peter de Winchester, the keeper of the wardrobe, was ordered to grant fees, as a special grace, to certain household knights. (*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 326).

¹¹⁵ *CLR*, 1267-72, p. 82.

¹¹⁶ *CPR*, 1266-72, p. 324; *CLR*, 1267-72, p. 82.

in return for him releasing and quitclaiming his 60m fee and arrears¹¹⁷. The largest quittance of a fee and associated arrears concerned Oliver de Chaleys. In May 1269, he remitted to the king all the arrears of his yearly fee of £100, totalling 2250m, and also 500m which the king was bound to him for when Oliver came to the king's homage. For this 'courtesy', Henry granted Oliver 500m¹¹⁸. As well as demonstrating the policy of fee cancellation, the chancery records also highlight the problems that Henry had previously been having in keeping up to date with his fee payments. The arrears of Oliver de Chaleys, as stated in the *Patent Rolls*, date back to 15 years previously, i.e. to the mid 1250s. Also from May 1269, the *Liberate Rolls* record an order to the treasurer and chamberlains to pay 100m to Mary wife of Alard de Selingham, Alard having remitted his fee at the exchequer in return for prompt payment of this sum¹¹⁹. Other writs, from December 1269 and February 1270, suggest that Henry had to pay Alard 200m for his fee arrears and the remission of Alard's fee of 40m year, with a second yearly fee of 20m still being reserved to Alard¹²⁰. In July 1269, Gaston de Bearn surrendered his fee of 50m a year and the arrears accruing to it, in return for which the king granted to him 600m from the first wards, escheats or marriage rights that fell in¹²¹. A similar grant was made to William de Chabbeney in May 1270 whereby he seems to have

¹¹⁷CLR, 1267-72, p. 64.

¹¹⁸CPR, 1266-72, p. 337; CLR, 1267-72, p. 79.

¹¹⁹CLR, 1267-72, p. 83.

¹²⁰CLR, 1267-72, pp. 110, 117.

¹²¹CPR, 1266-72, p. 361.

received a wardship in return for remitting his fee, its arrears and his other demands of the king¹²². In December 1269, £110 out of the Norwich tenth was commanded to be paid to William de Pernes, in part satisfaction of 240m, for which the king was bound to him for remission of his yearly fee and for arrears of the said fee¹²³. In February 1270, John de Culturis, in return for releasing his 20m fee with arrears, was granted 60m out of the ecclesiastical tenth being levied in the bishopric of Lincoln¹²⁴. Two months later, in April, Guy de Lusignan released and quitclaimed to the king his fee of £300 with arrears on the condition that he received 1000m, half payable at Michaelmas 1270 and half at Easter 1271¹²⁵. The above thus demonstrates that a policy of cancelling and prohibiting fee payments was being introduced after the civil war, perhaps suggesting that an attempt was being made to remedy the complaint previously raised by the reformers about the excessive granting of fees¹²⁶.

The figures for authorised fee payments out of the exchequer disguise the true value of fees and associated arrears that the king was having to cover. The bulk of fee payments during this period were via local officials who had been commanded to make such payments out of the issues of their offices. These payments, in a few cases, involved covering fee arrears dating back to the 1250s and highlight, as suggested

¹²²*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 428.

¹²³*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 399.

¹²⁴*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 408; *CLR*, 1267-72, p. 117.

¹²⁵*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 419; *CLR*, 1267-72, p. 121.

¹²⁶*DBM*, p.277.

previously, evidence that from the mid 1250s onwards Henry could not meet all his financial commitments. These payments can also be interpreted as perhaps showing evidence that the reformers, between 1258-60, had not been honouring previous grants of fees by the king, hence helping to create this backlog of fee arrears. That they were finally paid or partially covered in the late 1260s suggests that it was not until that time that Henry finally had the means to pay these arrears - this means being the ecclesiastical tenth granted to him by the pope. This is further demonstrated through the very small totals for fee payments out of the shire and foreign accounts on the credit table, i.e. the traditional sources of revenue available to the king were not sufficient to help him cover his debts for fee arrears.

In February 1268, the king ordered the tenth collectors to pay £600 out of the tenth to the archbishop of Tarentaise for fee arrears stretching back nine years¹²⁷, and another 300m for fee arrears for ten years to the cardinal deacon of St. Angelo¹²⁸. The following month, ten years of alm arrears, worth 200m, was ordered to be paid out of the tenth to the hospital of St. Antony¹²⁹. In April 1268, 275m, for nine years fee arrears, were ordered to be paid out of the tenth to the cardinal deacon of SS. Cosmas and Damian¹³⁰. A notification in October in the *Patent Rolls* records the means by which William de Calviniaco

¹²⁷CPR, 1266-72, p. 190, 196.

¹²⁸CPR, 1266-72, p. 197.

¹²⁹CPR, 1266-72, p. 206.

¹³⁰CPR, 1266-72, p. 215.

was receiving payment of 2000m worth of arrears for his 200m a year fee¹³¹.

The payments listed in the paragraph above reflect those fees where it can be clearly determined that arrears were stemming back to the 1250s. The bulk of fee payments authorised are not stated as having stemmed from that far back (though it is possible in a few cases that perhaps they did). In addition to the sums paid out for the release of fees, as mentioned previously, several other large payments were authorised for the payment of fee arrears. Again, most of these payments came out of the ecclesiastical tenth. £300 worth of fee arrears were ordered to be paid out of the tenth to the Bishop of Ostia and Vallettri in December 1267, and £100 fee arrears to Baldwin de Villa¹³². However, the £100 ordered to be paid to Baldwin appears not to have been carried out since, in March 1268, the guardians of the bishopric of Winchester were ordered to pay him this £100 sum¹³³. £100 of the Hereford tenth was ordered to be paid to Richard de Monet for fee arrears in February 1268¹³⁴. For March to May 1268, out of the tenth, 1800m was ordered to be paid to the count of Bigorre, 147.5m to Guy de Chaneteny, 160m to Angelus, canon of Cambrai, 200m to Florence de Varenna, and 210m to Angelus again (though this possibly covered the sum contained in his previous entry), these all being for fee arrears¹³⁵.

¹³¹*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 370-1.

¹³²*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 170, 178.

¹³³*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 206.

¹³⁴*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 189.

¹³⁵*CPR, 1266-72*, pp. 215, 216, 224, 232.

In September 1268, Gaston, vicomte of Bearn, was promised payment of 500m on the octaves of Martinmas of the 1000m fee arrears owed to him¹³⁶. In November 1268, the Bishop of Worcester was allowed 200m due to him for fee arrears in the fine he made with the king for the tenth of his bishopric¹³⁷. The same month, the bishop of Winchester was ordered to pay, out of the tenth in his bishopric, 1625m to Philip of Savoy for his fee arrears¹³⁸. Also in the same month, the Suffolk sheriff was ordered to levy £509 10s out of the eyre and deliver it to the abbess of Fontevrault for fee arrears¹³⁹. In May 1269, Arnulf de Gymeri is recorded as receiving his fee arrears of 140m out of the fine that the Prior of St. Swithun's made for having the king's goodwill¹⁴⁰. In July 1269, 200m of the London tenth was delivered to Guy de Lusignan for fee arrears and other debts¹⁴¹. In addition, as noted previously, money due to the king from Llywelyn, prince of Wales was also being directed towards covering fee arrears. Similarly, money out of the tenth was going towards covering the arrears of the pope's yearly cess.

With the numbers and total amount of these authorised fee payments out of the tenth, or other large financial issues, dropping after the Autumn of 1269, it is possible that by that time most of the backlog of fee arrears had been covered and

¹³⁶*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 258.

¹³⁷*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 297.

¹³⁸*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 304.

¹³⁹*CLR, 1267-72*, p. 53.

¹⁴⁰*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 339-40.

¹⁴¹*CPR, 1266-72*, p. 348, 350, 356.

cancellation achieved. Given that the authorised *liberate* writ total for fee payments out of the exchequer drops for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270 as compared to the two previous years, this could well have been the case¹⁴².

It was the payment of purchases and munitions that comprised the largest category of expenditure out of the exchequer for the king in the years following Michaelmas 1267. Whether the *liberate* writs issued for such payments were paid out at the exchequer or, as seems to have been the case in previous years, not been honoured at the exchequer cannot be fully determined through a lack of issue rolls. However, as with fee payments, the majority of such authorised payments were to come, not from the exchequer, but from local financial issues such as the ecclesiastical tenth. It is extremely difficult to calculate with any accuracy what the total amount of expenditure was for these purchases/ munitions out of non-exchequer issues since the *allocate* and *contrabreve* writs contained on the *Liberate Rolls* do not match the authorised expenditure recorded on the *Patent Rolls*. As the dominant expenditure, for allowances against the tenth, seems to be noted on the *Patent Rolls*, it will be the expenditure noted on these rolls that will be concentrated upon. Out of the tenth, £2625 16s 7d was set aside for purchases/ munitions expenditure for Michaelmas 1267-68, £495 15s 7d for Michaelmas 1268-69, and £1205 12s for Michaelmas 1269-70. These figures are probably an under estimate of such expenditure out of the tenth since entries for debt and loan repayments to

¹⁴²Although this policy of fee cancellation does continue into Edward I's reign (as will be discussed in the next chapter).

merchants noted on the *Patent Rolls* could well have included sums due for the purchase of goods on the king's behalf. These loan repayments noted to merchants total £2248 6s 8d for Michaelmas 1267-68, £271 1m for the following year and nothing for Michaelmas 1269-70¹⁴³. Even this total figure for both sets of payments of just under £6850 is probably lower than the actual totals for proceeds of the tenth set aside for the payment of purchases/ munitions. Whatever the problems over exactly determining such expenditure out of the tenth, what is clear is that, without this taxation grant from the papacy, Henry would not have been able to cover his expenditure commitments.

The expenses category of expenditure is perhaps the hardest to deal with. The *liberate* writs which have been entered in this category in the expenditure table are fairly clear cut, i.e. being commands to the exchequer either to pay out money to royal officials to pursue the king's business or commands to compensate people for losses sustained in the king's service (usually for the loss of horses). However, entries on other documentary rolls are not so straight forward. Many of the deductions from the tenth for expenses referred to officials being paid either for the pursuit of their duties in collecting and auditing this tax or for the pursuit of other royal business. In addition, other such 'expense' deductions, whether from the tenth or other financial issues available to the king, often refer to expenditure incurred on the king's behalf during the civil war and hence consist of a variety of expenditure items such as the payment of

¹⁴³These totals exclude money spent on buying back royal jewellery pawned for money.

soldiers, the purchase of munitions, and the costs of providing and repairing castle and town defences. For example, in August 1268, the *Patent Rolls* record an acknowledgement that Henry was bound to Roger de Leybourne for £3094 10s 1. 5d for Roger's expenses in keeping certain towns and castles, the Tower of London, for horses lost in the king's service, for keeping the king's peace in parts of the Weald, Huntingdon, Essex and elsewhere, and for going abroad¹⁴⁴. This *Patent Roll* entry followed an audit contained in the Michaelmas 1266 to Michaelmas 1267 pipe roll outlining Roger's receipts and expenditure in the pursuit of these duties¹⁴⁵. In paying off this debt, Henry assigned to Roger de Leybourne the receipts from several sources: a marriage right, a manor, part of the bishopric of Lincoln's tenth, tallage from Nottingham/Derby, money due from Llywelyn, the issues of the counties of Salop/Staffs and Hereford for one year, £400 from the dower of the countess of Leicester in Ireland¹⁴⁶. Similarly, for July 1269, Roger de Mortimer is recorded, on the *Liberate Rolls*, as receiving an *allocate* writ for £445 10s 3d for the munitions of Hereford castle, for expenses and for wages¹⁴⁷.

Outgoings authorised out of the exchequer to other areas of expenditure were not particularly high as compared to the years prior to the civil war. The exception to this for these other areas was money authorised to be paid from the exchequer direct into the wardrobe. This totalled £6008 for the years

¹⁴⁴*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 251-2.

¹⁴⁵E. 372/111, m. 55d.

¹⁴⁶*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 252, 254, 397.

¹⁴⁷*CLR*, 1267-72, p. 89.

Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270, which on a yearly basis compares with such cash flows from before the civil war. The wardrobe account of Peter of Winchester, from March 1268 to November 1272, which covers most of these three years gives a figure of £37,761 10s 10. 5d for total receipts, of which £12,109 5s 7. 5d resulted from direct payments from the exchequer¹⁴⁸. Thus, only about 33 per cent of the wardrobe receipts came straight from the exchequer. This does show a small increase, in terms of the wardrobe being financed by the exchequer, over the previous account for the wardrobe of Nicholas de Leukenor between 7th August 1265 to the 3rd March 1268¹⁴⁹. But the overwhelming majority of wardrobe revenue was still coming from sources other than the exchequer.

Of these other categories, payments out of the exchequer to members of the royal family were the next largest (contained in the miscellaneous section) and which totalled £1236 for the years Michaelmas 1268-70¹⁵⁰, whilst there does not appear to be anything notable about the totals for gifts, alms, building works or miscellaneous.

The value of *liberate* writs for debt repayment does not show any particularly large figures for any of the three years, the total value of these writs being only £1023 for all three years Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270. This is not particularly surprising since the king paid off or partly paid debts that he owed out of non-exchequer issues such as the tenth. However,

¹⁴⁸E. 372/116, m. 1.

¹⁴⁹E. 372/115, m. 2.

¹⁵⁰There being no such authorised *liberate* writs for Michaelmas 1267-68.

there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the king was having problems in these years in balancing his income and expenditure commitments despite the tenth taxation grant and the money due from Llywelyn. In June 1268, Henry requested that the archbishop of Canterbury lend him £100 (repayment of which was to come from the tenth in his province) so that he could redeem jewels that he had pawned in France and which he was in danger of losing¹⁵¹. A similar request, in August 1268, was made to the abbot of Waltham asking him to deliver 100m of the tenth on his benefices to Walter de London so that Walter could redeem royal jewels that had been pawned beyond seas '*as the king has no money in hand for this*'¹⁵². In November 1268, a mandate was sent to the dean and chapter of Wells asking them to send 200m of the fine they made for their tenth to be delivered into the wardrobe '*as the king is in great want of money*'¹⁵³. A similar order, in April 1269 was sent to the dean and chapter of Chichester asking them to pay over £53 2s 9d of their tenth arrears to the king as '*the king is at present in the greatest need of money to expedite his business*'¹⁵⁴. Whilst in the following month, May 1269, the *Patent Rolls* record two letters of credit issued to John de Chishull and Peter de Winchester empowering them to pawn the king's jewels to the amounts of £100 and £20 if necessary¹⁵⁵. The final suggestion of cash flow problems comes

¹⁵¹CPR, 1266-72, p. 241.

¹⁵²CPR, 1266-72, p. 252.

¹⁵³CPR, 1266-72, p. 297.

¹⁵⁴CPR, 1266-72, p. 328.

¹⁵⁵CPR, 1266-72, p. 343.

from August 1269 when the king received £100 from the guardians of the bishopric of Chichester for the pursuit of '*urgent business*' and promised to repay this sum on the octaves of Hilary¹⁵⁶.

Apart from the last two entries mentioned above, these requests for money by the king were not loans but rather credits against the tenth. As for the king taking out loans during this period, it is difficult to determine from the *Patent Rolls* and *Liberate Rolls* whether loan repayments stemmed from money borrowed from before Michaelmas 1267 or after this date. Alongside this, these loans could well refer to money owed by the king for purchases made for the maintenance of his household (as mentioned previously). Therefore, in the analysis below, these problems have been ignored and all references to loans and loan repayments contained in the *Liberate Rolls* and *Patent Rolls* between Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1270 have been used, whether they were contracted before Michaelmas 1267 or not. It has been assumed that the bulk of loan repayments probably refer to loans taken out before Michaelmas 1267 since only two commands on these rolls from the king have been traced asking his officials to contract loans after that date (other than the two above mentioned letters of credit to John de Chishull and Peter de Winchester). These were from May 1269 when *liberate* writs for £10 and 120m were authorised, the money to be borrowed from merchants if necessary to cover these payments¹⁵⁷. However, it is possible that these might be connected with the command at the

¹⁵⁶*CPR*, 1266-72, p. 361.

¹⁵⁷*CLR*, 1267-72, pp. 80, 82.

same time to the above mentioned John and Peter to pawn some of the king's jewels.

Although there are not many commands to contract loans, there is evidence of the king borrowing money. A *liberate* writ for £100 was issued in November 1268 to the archbishop of York for money lent to the king¹⁵⁸. This could well be connected with a later entry contained on the *Patent Rolls* for February 1270 when the king ordered £20 out of the issues of the London exchange to be granted to the archbishop, with a promise to pay another £100 as soon as possible, for £120 lent to the king¹⁵⁹. For July and August 1269, *liberate* writs for 120m and 300m were authorised for the payment of purchases and expenses, these sums initially having been borrowed from merchants¹⁶⁰. Also from July of that year is a *liberate* writ for 500m to certain Jews, payment of which was to be after Michaelmas, for money borrowed from them to make purveyances¹⁶¹. In addition, the wardrobe accounts for March 1268 to November 1272 record £1330 3s 4d as having been received from loans¹⁶², of which entries for £100, £200 and £120 probably refer to the money noted above as being borrowed from the bishopric of Chichester, from merchants and from the York archbishopric. However, it is possible that the remainder of this £1330 sum was actually borrowed after Michaelmas 1270.

¹⁵⁸CLR, 1267-72, p. 57.

¹⁵⁹CPR, 1266-67, p. 406.

¹⁶⁰CLR, 1267-72, pp. 93, 94.

¹⁶¹CLR, 1267-72, p. 92.

¹⁶²E. 372/116, m. 1.

As for the repayment of money borrowed on the collateral of pledged jewellery, the king was spending reasonably large sums of money in honouring them. For the year Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268, only one such authorised payment has been traced out of the exchequer. In January 1268, a *liberate* writ for £45 was issued for acquitting the king's and queen's jewels which had been pledged in London at the king's command¹⁶³. However, for the same year, 608m appears to have been spent from other financial issues for similar acquittals. This consisted of 100m out of the issues of the London bishopric being paid to Bernard Nicholai in part payment of the king's debts to him for jewels which the king took, an order to pay 200m out of the Canterbury and Winchester tenths to the abbot of Westminster for the ransom of jewels pawned with merchants, and an order to Master Poncius and William de Gloucester to pay 308m out of the issues of the king's exchange '*wherein the king is bound for jewels pawned to merchants beyond seas*'¹⁶⁴. The following financial year, Michaelmas 1268 to Michaelmas 1269, saw a larger sum of money being directed towards redeeming jewels. £53 of the Norwich tenth was ordered to be paid to Bernard Nicholai in May 1269 for jewels and loans which the king was bound to him for¹⁶⁵. The same month, an acknowledgement was issued that 825m out of the Norwich tenth had been delivered to Philip de Arraz, a royal clerk, so that he could redeem the king's jewels pawned

¹⁶³CLR, 1267-72, p. 10.

¹⁶⁴CPR, 1266-72, pp. 211, 217, 288.

¹⁶⁵CPR, 1266-72, p. 337.

overseas¹⁶⁶. Another acknowledgement, from June 1269, for 1000m out of the Norwich tenth is contained in the *Patent Rolls*, this sum was recorded as having been paid to Philip de Arraz and presumably included the 825m sum mentioned previously¹⁶⁷. In the following month, July 1269, a *liberate* writ for £160 was issued to merchants to pay for jewels pledged to them for certain necessities of the wardrobe taken from them¹⁶⁸. As for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270, no such payments have been traced as regards the king redeeming jewels pawned with merchants or with others.

Similarly, one sees very large amounts being directed for the repayment of borrowed money between Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1269. As noted previously, the financial year Michaelmas 1267 to Michaelmas 1268 saw £2248 6s 8d from the tenth being ordered to be spent on loan repayments to merchants. In addition to this, a *liberate* writ for 462m 8d was issued in June 1268 to the chancellor and treasurer for money that they had borrowed from Florentine merchants¹⁶⁹. The following year, a lower amount of the tenth revenue was used to cover such loan repayments - £271 1m. Alongside this, orders for 300m and £200 were made during this year for payment to merchants, out of the exchequer issues, for money borrowed from them by the king¹⁷⁰. On top of all this, there was the money being directed from the

¹⁶⁶CPR, 1266-72, p. 340.

¹⁶⁷CPR, 1266-72, p. 347.

¹⁶⁸CLR, 1267-72, p. 88.

¹⁶⁹CLR, 1267-72, p. 37.

¹⁷⁰CPR, 1266-72, pp. 322, 344.

general eyre towards covering the money which Richard, the king's brother, had loaned the king. Again, as with the redeeming of pawned jewels, there are no such allowances for loan repayments contained in the *Patent Rolls* for Michaelmas 1269 to Michaelmas 1270. This possibly suggests that by this financial year, the king had finally covered most of the outstanding debts and dues that he owed.

What is clearly apparent from the evidence relating to the king borrowing money and pawning his jewellery is the degree to which the king was reliant on the church tenth for covering the debts that he had undertaken. Without this taxation windfall, it is very unlikely that Henry would have been able to both pay off the large sums of money that he owed and to redeem the jewellery that he had pawned.

The financial recovery of the crown after the years of civil war was a slow one, with exchequer issues and receipts still falling short of the equivalent figures of the mid 1250s. The traditional sources of revenue to the crown, i.e. the demesne, the issues of the eyre, feudal issues, were still not producing significant sums of money for the exchequer and wardrobe, though Henry's granting of land and feudal rights to his family and supporters had helped contribute to this occurrence. However, gradual improvements in the area of exchequer administration and control over the shires can be seen to have occurred since Evesham, though the level of such control, as shown by shrieval attendance at the exchequer and the proffers paid in, still did not compare with that from fifteen years previously.

The mainstay of the crown's financial policy during these years was the payment of its debts and the clearing and cancellation of fees. The size of these debts was massive, and it was only through the receipts of church taxation and the payments from Llywelyn that the king could attempt to pay off the undertakings that he had made. The traditional sources of income for Henry, i.e. the shire and foreign accounts, were proving to be insufficient to provide him with an alternative means of covering these debts. However, to the crown's credit, this policy appears to have been successful since fewer payments towards these areas were being made after Michaelmas 1269.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

It was apparent by the mid 1250s that Henry III was struggling to balance his expenditure with his income, whilst at the same time satisfying all the demands on his patronage. The first of the major findings of this thesis has been to show that this situation had occurred through the relatively low level of revenue available to the crown at the time of the revolution in 1258. Royal income from the traditional sources of revenue having declined from both the levels of John's reign and the levels of the 1240s with no additional and different sources of income having been developed to fill the void. Thus the revolution of 1258 was not directly produced by financial pressures as had been the case in the opposition to John, though there was discontent with aspects of the financial administration such as the sheriffs and the eyre. However, the fall in Henry's income did mean that Henry was unable to resist the opponents of his regime in 1258, lacking the resources to buy off the opposition. The one source of income that could have helped the financial situation of the crown in the mid 1250s, general taxation, had only been conceded infrequently during the earlier years of Henry's reign. Thereafter, in the twenty years prior to 1258, the king had not been prepared to

grant the political and administrative concessions needed to secure consent to taxation. However, as the pressures of fulfilling promises of patronage and the demands made on the king by his Sicilian ambitions increasing, Henry was forced in 1258 to bow down to demands for reform of the machinery of his government.

The reforms which were subsequently introduced aimed at reducing the abuses associated with the behaviour of the king's financial officials in the localities. However, as has been demonstrated by the second major finding of the thesis, the actual implementation of reform was mixed in its results. The reformers abided by their promises to introduce local sheriffs holding office for a year and accounting for the variable profits above the county farms. However, each of these reforms was short-lived, whilst the promised reform of paying custodial sheriffs salaries for their tenure in office was not carried out by the reformers in full (the overwhelming majority of salary allowances being granted by the king's regime after Evesham). Attempts at improving the administration of the exchequer and changing the means of financing the wardrobe were also made but the results were not impressive. The problem of outstanding shrieval arrears continued into the 1260s and the wardrobe still continued to be funded from non-exchequer sources. As regards the king's income, the reformers' policies cannot be said to have contributed to increasing the revenue available to the crown, the increase in the income figures witnessed for the Michaelmas 1259-60 year was not a result of their policies, it was more a reflection on the money being received from the French king. However, and as the third major finding of the thesis, it can be said that at least crown finance did not collapse during the reformers' tenure in power.

The fourth major finding concerns the rise and fall of Henry's income in the immediate period following the years of reform, the period which marked Henry's recovery and then subsequent loss of power. The large income that he received during the years 1261 to 1262 helped to contribute to his ascendancy during these years. However, the decline in income that set in during the course of the Michaelmas 1262-63 year meant that, at the time of renewed political turmoil in the Summer of 1263, Henry did not have the financial resources with which to successfully combat the opposition to his regime. The notable point here concerns the importance of a healthy financial situation to the stability of the king's control over the country. The two times that Henry had to bow down to the wishes of his opponents, in 1258 and then in 1263, both came at times of financial weakness for the king.

The outbreak of civil war severely disrupted crown revenue, as demonstrated by the income figures for the years Michaelmas 1263-65, with the only financial change of note during these years being the re-introduction of custodial sheriffs during de Montfort's ascendancy. However, and as the fifth major finding of the thesis, de Montfort's limited tenure in power did see relative improvements in the level of exchequer efficiency with payments into the exchequer at the Easter 1265 proffer and attendance at the exchequers of receipt and audit by the de Montfortian sheriffs being higher than for the years either side of his regime. This occurrence thus suggesting that de Montfort and his supporters were able to exercise a relatively high degree of control over local administration.

Following the victory at Evesham, the government administration passed back into the hands of the king. The sixth major finding of the thesis has been to show just how slow the recovery of the crown's income and financial administration was after this recovery of power. Cash receipts for the king were depressed as a result of the number of debts that had to be paid off. The king's total notional income still fell short of the levels of the mid 1250s. There were no major reforms or changes in the way that the crown was financed in these years, though the genesis of some of the ideas and policies that Edward put into practice can be found in these years. Instead, what is clearly apparent is how badly the king's 'ordinary' revenue had been affected by the civil war. It was only through the 'extraordinary' income resulting from the taxation on the church and the money being received from Llywelyn that the king was able to pay off the debts that he owed.

When comparing the revenue tables at the end of Henry's reign with those of the mid 1250s, it appears that his income had declined over the intervening years. In the earlier period, the king's total notional income averaged out at around £27,500 a year alongside an average cash income of around £17,000 a year, but by the end of the 1260s, the corresponding totals were down to £22,820 and £12,7000 respectively¹.

Therefore it would appear that the financial and administrative legacy that Henry left his son, Edward I, was not particularly impressive. This can be partly seen by the estimate of

¹These figures are based on the totals for adjusted revenue.

Edward's revenue drawn up at the exchequer in the 1284 Easter term, as highlighted by M. H. Mills². This estimate placed the financial resources of the English crown at just under £27,000 a year³. Of this £27,000, £8000 was estimated as being the revenue available through the imposition of customs. Since this area of issues had not been available to Henry III, one can calculate that the amount of revenue contained on this estimate which stemmed from the same financial resources that had been exploited by Henry as being in the region of £19,000 a year. This figure of £19,000 shows a slight fall from the average total notional income per year of £22,820 quoted in the last chapter for the period Michaelmas 1267-Michaelmas 1270. However, the totals for these three years contain receipts of £9103 paid into the wardrobe from the issues of the ecclesiastical tenth that was being levied during these years. If this 'extraordinary' income, which was not normally available to the crown, is deducted from the income totals, then the yearly average total notional income for Michaelmas 1267-70 falls to approximately £19,800, a figure almost equal to the £19,000 available to Edward I according to the Easter 1284 term estimate. Therefore, given that the total nominal value for Henry III's income in the mid 1250s was approximately £27,500 annually, as noted above, the latter years of Henry's reign saw a sizeable reduction in the financial resources available to the crown.

²M. H. Mills, 'Exchequer Agenda and Estimate of Revenue, Easter Term 1284', *EHR*, xl (1925), p. 229-234.

³*Ibid.*, p. 234.

The fall in revenue during and after the civil war in the mid 1260s bears comparison with the years after the civil war at the end of John's reign and the early years of Henry III's minority. In the years 1208-1212, John's total notional income averaged out at just under £62,000 a year. The years of war and the immediate aftermath saw a total collapse in income with the recovery being a slow and gradual process. By the mid 1220s, Henry III's total notional income was only averaging out at £14,000 year⁴. Even the figures of £42,000 year for total notional income for the early 1240s do not match these earlier figures for John's reign. From this it would appear that the civil war had disrupted and permanently reduced the financial resources which the English crown could call upon in the first part of the thirteenth century. Similarly, the years after the civil war of the 1260s see a slow recovery in crown finances, and what seems to have been another permanent reduction in the financial resources available to the crown, with the exchequer estimate of yearly revenue in 1284 suggesting that nearly twenty years after the civil war, the king's 'ordinary' revenue had still not recovered to its pre-war levels.

Following on from this point about the fall in both cash and total notional income over the period 1255-70, the changes in the individual categories of revenue need to be examined more closely.

Cash receipts from the shire farms and increments had, by the years 1267-70, recovered to a level comparable to

⁴N. Barrett, forthcoming London PhD thesis; D. A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990), pp. 413-7.

that of the mid 1250s with average cash receipts of £1237 for 1267-70 as compared with £1146 for 1255-58. This slight increase for the later period reflects fewer credits made against the shire farms and increments for local expenditure purposes, hence enabling slightly more cash to be paid into the exchequer and wardrobe. In contrast, the level of liable fixed increments had actually decreased between the two periods⁵. The figure of approximately £2800 a year in force for increments in the mid 1250s was some 55% higher than those being applied in the late 1260s.

It is notable that, as a proportion of total cash receipts received from the shire accounts, cash income from the county farms and the fixed increments was comparatively higher for 1267-70 than for any previous period in the 15 years covered by this thesis. Approximately 18 per cent of shire account cash receipts were derived from this source in the years 1267-70 as compared to approximately 8 per cent for 1255-58, implying that the imposition of the levels of fixed increments after the civil war had a more severe effect on the localities than those imposed during the mid 1250s. Since the civil war had disrupted the crown's overall revenue, these totals for income from shire issues for the late 1260s could well have provided collection problems and grievances against the sheriffs. J. R. Maddicott comments on this matter that the Hundred Roll inquiries from the mid 1270s suggest that the levels of increments '*may have been difficult to raise without the heavy shrieval pressure which had*

⁵J. R. Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons of Baronial Reform: Local Government, 1258-80', *Thirteenth Century England I*, p. 6

characterised the years before 1258 and that *'the farming of the hundreds at extortionate rates was an almost universal grievance throughout the counties'*⁶. He also notes that the Hundred Roll inquiries demonstrate the unpopularity of the post Evesham sheriffs⁷. The situation regarding shrieval administration of the localities for the late 1260s thus shows similarities to that of the mid 1250s. The grievances raised by the reformers in 1258-59 would therefore appear to have not been heeded by the crown following its victory in the civil war, resulting in similar complaints about the behaviour of the post-Evesham sheriffs as there had been against the sheriffs of the 1250s.

The administrative recovery in the exchequer's dealings with the sheriffs was a drawn out process following the civil war. It was not until the early years of Edward I's reign that shrieval attendance at the exchequers of receipt and audit along with the proffers made by the sheriffs reached the levels of the years 1255-61. M. H. Mills has shown that it was only from 1273 that the numbers of sheriffs attending the exchequer of receipt to make their proffers equalled the equivalent numbers from the years of reform when shrieval attendance at the exchequer reached its peak for the 1255-70 period⁸. Similarly, the value to the exchequer of the proffers made did not recover to pre-civil war levels until the same year. The figure of £2419 for 1273 had only been reached and passed 11 years earlier in 1262, whilst the average proffer totals for the 5 years 1274-78 had been

⁶Ibid., p. 6

⁷Ibid., p. 7.

⁸M. H. Mills, '"Adventus Vicecomitum", 1258-72', *EHR*, 36 (1921), p. 492.

surpassed only during the years 1254-58⁹. Attendance by sheriffs at the upper exchequer for the audits of their accounts followed the same path. It was not until the 1271-72 pipe roll was drawn up that over 75% of the sheriffs attended the exchequer of audit, and again it was not until the years 1273-77 that the attendance of sheriffs at this exchequer reached the levels of the mid 1250s¹⁰. Therefore, following de Montfort's defeat at Evesham in 1265, it took the exchequer around 7 to 8 years to regain the level of administrative authority and efficiency comparable to that of the years 1255-61, thus reflecting on how strongly the civil war had disrupted the king's financial administration. Again, this bears comparison to the civil war earlier in the century, i.e. the length of the period of recovery in administrative effectiveness following Evesham was not that different to that undergone in the years after the civil war at the very beginning of Henry III's reign. The evidence from this earlier period is patchy but that which remains implies a very similar pattern. D. A. Carpenter has highlighted figures for the years after the Peace of Lambeth of September 1217 that suggest it took between 5 to 7 years for the crown's revenues to pick up. The totals he quotes for income audited on the pipe rolls, income recorded on the surviving receipt rolls and for the remaining *Adventi Vicecomitum* all suggest that for the four years after the Peace of Lambeth the crown's financial situation was fairly dire with income at relatively insignificant levels and that it was not until after 1222 that revenue started to

⁹Ibid., p. 494.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 488.

pick up¹¹. This therefore implies that the financial administration during the years 1217-22 was operating in a fairly disjointed manner and that it took quite a time for it to regain a level approaching full effectiveness, a situation similar to that of the second half of the 1260s.

Perhaps the most notable and important change concerning the crown's revenues was that connected with the fall in demesne revenue. In the mid 1250s this category of receipts had produced cash income averaging around £5013 a year, whilst by the late 1260s it was only producing approximately £2212 a year¹². Reasons have already been given in the previous two chapters for this fall, i.e. the reduction in farm payments caused by damage in the civil war and the large grants of land made to Queen Eleanor. It is likely that this source of revenue picked up in Edward's reign, but its importance as a major source of revenue was much diminished. The 1284 exchequer estimate does not throw much light on the proceeds of demesne revenue for the crown, the reference to proceeds of land issues being the '*summa corporum comitatum*'. This entry gave a value of £10,168 3s 1.75d and equates to the value of the old farms of the shires before deductions for *terrīs datīs* were made¹³. Thus, it does not provide for a comparison of changes in demesne revenue for the crown between Edward's reign and that of his father's reign. However, W. M. Ormrod has produced figures that suggest that the

¹¹D. A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III*, pp. 413-16.

¹²These figures include demesne issues noted on both the shire and foreign accounts on the pipe rolls.

¹³Mills, 'Exchequer Agenda', pp. 230, 233.

size of revenue from both shire and demesne issues, whilst staying constant in monetary terms over the course of the thirteenth century, had decreased in relative terms. He gives totals of £7000 per annum on average being produced by the shires and demesne lands for John's reign and a similar figure for Edward I's reign. However, as a percentage of total revenue noted by Ormrod, these totals produced about 75 per cent of John's revenue and 35 per cent of Edward's revenue¹⁴. This suggestion of the declining importance of demesne revenue to the crown is also implied by the comparisons of demesne revenue received by Henry III in the 1240s with that received by him in the 1250s and 1260s, whereby he was receiving less cash income in the latter period as compared to the earlier period, as is demonstrated by the table below:-

Average Annual Cash Revenue from Demesne Lands ¹⁵	
Period	Cash into ward/exch.
Mich. 1240-45 ¹⁶	£5638
Mich. 1255-58	£5013
Mich. 1258-61	£4483
Mich. 1261-63	£3433
Mich. 1263-67	£2486
Mich. 1267-70	£2212

¹⁴W. M. Ormrod, Handout to the 1993 Newcastle upon Tyne Conference.

However, these figures are slightly misleading in that he only notes certain types of revenue - shire, demesne, customs, mines, Ireland.

¹⁵For both the shire and foreign accounts on the pipe rolls.

¹⁶R. C. Stacey, *Politics, Policy and Finance 1216-1245* (Oxford, 1987), p. 210.

From the table it can be seen that, by 1270, cash revenue from the demesne had shrunk by a considerable extent over the thirty year period from 1240, the average annual figure for this source of income having decreased by some 60 per cent between the 1240-45 and the 1267-70 period. Given this very large fall in cash revenue from demesne issues, it is not surprising that this was one of the first matters that Edward I addressed when he succeeded to the throne, vowing at his coronation to recover the lands belonging to the crown which had been alienated by his father¹⁷.

The other dominant financial resource available to Henry from the 1250s, the income from judicial issues, also fell away towards the end of the reign. The eyre initiated after the civil war did not generate anywhere near a comparable level of income for the crown as compared to the eyres held during the 1250s. This was perhaps not surprising given the level of turmoil within the country caused by the civil war. However, whether this 1255-70 period marks the beginnings of the end of the use of justices in eyre is uncertain. Certainly, the holding of eyres was a contentious issue throughout this period as has been noted previously with the complaint in 1256 about the impoverishment of the kingdom through frequent eyres, the attention paid by the reformers to the administration of the eyre, and complaints concerning the breaking of the seven year limit for holding an eyre in a particular county, i.e. the case of Lincoln in 1269. The

¹⁷M. Prestwich, *Edward I* (London, 1988), p. 91; Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons of Baronial Reform', p. 10.

time was coming when, as a means of raising revenue and imposing justice on the localities, the visitations of the justices would not be worth the trouble given the political grievances they raised. Following Henry's death in 1272, the eyre in progress was suspended '*in circumstances designed to give this 'judicious bid for popularity' the widest publicity*'¹⁸. The eyre was not then re-used until 1278, four years after Edward's return to England, and was then virtually abandoned after 1294 with only visitations to two counties for the remainder of Edward's reign¹⁹. M. Prestwich suggests that the ending of the eyre system in 1294, coinciding as it did with the start of war with France, was a '*favour to the people*'²⁰. Thus, over the last 40 years of the thirteenth century, the eyre had become less and less important as a revenue category to the crown.

Jewish revenues had become less important to the crown in the later years of the reign. The heavy Jewish tallages of 1240-60 had delivered a very severe blow to the financial health of the Jewish community, leading to a decrease in receipts from this source of revenue for the 1255-70 period as compared to the 1240s. In fact the 1255-70 period saw anti-Jewish legislation. The reforms of 1258-59 included sections on the administration of the Jews²¹, de Montfort's period in power had seen attacks on Jews and their property and the acquittal of individuals from debts

¹⁸Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons of Baronial Reform', p. 8.

¹⁹Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 289.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 289.

²¹*DBM*, pp. 87, 109, 155.

owed to the Jews²². Although this latter policy was revoked by Henry III in 1266²³, the first of a series of anti-Jewish statutes over six years was introduced in 1269. This 1269 statute abolished perpetual fee-rents owed by Christians to Jews, these type of fee-rents being annual payments assigned on an estate which had to be paid until the end of time²⁴. Royal treatment of the Jews and their resources was not improved during Edward's reign. They were tallaged heavily in the 1270s, yet by the mid 1280s, income from the Jews was low - only £222 paid into the wardrobe from this source for 1282-84 - whilst the 1284 exchequer estimate placed revenue from the Jews as only £200 for the year²⁵. The major tallage on the Jews in the 1280s came in 1287 when they agreed to pay £12,000, although only £4,073 was actually paid²⁶. Edward eventually ended up expelling the Jews from the country, their use to him being unimportant. Royal demands on the Jews over the course of the second half of the century had greatly depleted their financial resources, whilst their expulsion enabled Edward to take over their debts and to sell their property²⁷. Therefore, as with the case of the judicial eyres, one of the major areas of income developed by the Angevins, had

²²R. C. Stacey, '1240-60: a Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations', *Historical Research*, lxi (1988), p. 146; *CPR, 1258-66*, p. 411; J. R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 315-16.

²³*CPR, 1258-66*, p. 628.

²⁴Stacey, '1240-60: a Watershed', pp. 144-45.

²⁵Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 344; Mills, 'Exchequer Agenda', p. 233.

²⁶Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 344.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 345.

ceased to be of importance to the crown by the end of the thirteenth century.

Cash income from the area of feudal receipts was comparatively small during the 1255-70 period, there being only one year in which the income from this source rose above £1000²⁸. The reason for this lies in the use of wardships, escheats and marriage rights to provide patronage, a policy most notably seen in the 1250s. Although there is evidence to suggest that the reformers intended to use the availability of wardships as means of trying to reduce the king's debts, no great or permanent change in policy as regards dealing with the issues of this source seem to have occurred over the years 1255-1270. This is reflected in the similarities in the situations that Henry faced in both the mid 1250s and at the end of the 1260s. In both periods, the availability of feudal rights for the direct benefit of the crown was not that large, this situation resulting from the backlog of grants of wardships, escheats etc. made by Henry and that had to be honoured. These patronage demands on the king thus reduced his potential cash income since such rights had to be given away the moment that they became available.

Changes in the other categories of shire revenue over the period of this thesis did not have any great effect on the levels of crown income. The receipts in the revenue tables recorded as having arisen from Forest issues are low throughout all 15 years (contributing a small percentage of annual income each year) and

²⁸This being the Michaelmas 1264-65 year and was due to the large payment received from Hugh Bigod as part of his fine for the custody of the lands of the Kyme inheritance.

changes in this category of income are thus of no particular importance. The only notable point is that at no time does there appear to have been any concerted effort to greatly increase the financial income from the forest. Proceeds from taxation were never high for the crown, reflecting the lack of any grants of a general lay subsidy in this period. The major taxation receipts received by the crown were those generated from the tenths on the church, and these were either granted to the papacy (the case in the 1250s) or were used to pay off the king's debts (as was the case in the 1260s). Anyway, these two grants were not accounted for nor recorded on the pipe rolls.

It is therefore apparent that the categories contributing the most to the crown's decline in income over the period 1255-70 were those of demesne and judicial revenue. The collapse in receipts from these sources after the civil war were not compensated for through an increase in receipts from other sources of income on the pipe rolls. Instead, it was the taxation on the church that generated the income that helped the crown keep afloat at the end of the 1260s.

What the figures for the individual categories of revenue suggest is that a turning point was being reached at the end of Henry III's reign and at the beginning of Edward's reign as regards the way that the crown needed to finance itself. The traditional areas of income for the crown had been declining since the 1240s and had been severely disrupted by the events of 1255-70. New areas of revenue thus needed to be developed to help fill this void.

These new developments in crown income and administration came during the course of Edward I's reign and can be seen to have partly stemmed from certain changes suggested and initiated in the 1255-70 period to the administration of government and finance. This can be seen through the policy of reducing fee payments that was initiated in the last years of Henry's reign and which was continued into Edward I's reign. For example, in November 1275, a £200 *liberate* writ was issued which authorised payment to Peter de Montfort of this sum in exchange for Peter releasing and quitclaiming his yearly fee of £50 and the associated arrears²⁹. Similarly, in the same month, *liberate* writs for 40s and 15m were authorised to Peter de Scoteny and the messenger of Edmund, the king's brother, for releasing their fees and maintenance payments³⁰. This latter writ to Edmund's messenger concerning the cancellation of the 4d daily which Edmund had been granted to receive at the exchequer by his father, Henry III, suggests that the cancellation of fee payments had been extended to other forms of annual payments out of the exchequer. This is further implied by a series of writs in the November 1274 to November 1275 *Liberate Roll*, which, from May 1275 onwards, contained orders for payments of various sums of money to individuals in return for these people releasing the sums of money due to them for alms or maintenance³¹. The above examples were a part of a wide spread policy, as is clear generally from the early *Liberate Rolls* of Edward I, where there

²⁹C. 62/51, m. 1.

³⁰C. 62/51, m. 2.

³¹C. 62/51, mm. 7, 8.

were large numbers of payments ordered for the buying out of annual fees, thus continuing the policy that had began in the latter years of Henry III's reign.

J. R. Maddicott has highlighted the similarities between aspects of Edward I's reform and administration of England as compared to those introduced by the reforming magnates between 1258 to 1260³². In the Hundred Roll enquiries, which Edward launched into the state of the realm in 1274-75, there were parallels with those used by the reformers to enquire into the state of local government. For example, Maddicott comments that abuse of the sheriff's tourn and the taking of bribes to allow felons to go free were investigated in 1258 and then in 1274 but not prior to these dates, and that the use of the *querela*, an informal complaint enabling poor men to complain about the actions of royal officials, was also common to both periods, Hugh Bigod's 1258 eyre having first brought their wholesale expansion³³. In addition, clauses contained in the 1275 Statute of Westminster showed similarities with aspects of the 1259 Provisions of Westminster³⁴.

Edward's policy towards the shrieval office holders was mixed. He had a common aim with that of the 1258 reformers of wanting to curtail shrieval misbehaviour and corruption, yet he was hesitant about making financial concessions to the shires in the form of lower increments, or conceding local sheriffs who might be unable to uphold royal interests against the magnates.

³²J. R. Maddicott, 'Edward I and the lessons of Baronial Reform', pp. 1-30.

³³Ibid., pp. 11, 12.

³⁴Ibid., p. 14.

Edward's first steps, between October to December 1274, were to impose a widespread change of holders of the sheriff's office with the shrievalties of 32 counties changing hands and 22 new appointments being made (similar to the 1258 wholesale change of sheriffs), signalling a new start and style of government³⁵. Of these changes, there was a slight tendency towards local men, but nothing significant, Edward's major priority being the protection of his own rights as seen by the oath imposed on the incoming sheriffs³⁶. Over the next few years, steps were taken to reform and to reduce the power of the sheriff's office, i.e. the Hundred Roll enquiries, the 1275 Statute of Westminster and the 1278 eyre. These were combined with limitations on the sheriff's legal jurisdiction, whereby means were provided for removing cases from the local courts, where the sheriffs presided, to the central court of Common Pleas. The effect of these changes was to limit the scope for shrieval misbehaviour³⁷.

A major administrative change was initiated in November 1275 with the two escheators north and south of the Trent being dismissed and the county sheriffs being given charge of the wardships and escheats. The sheriffs were then placed under the supervision of 3 stewards for these issues, each steward being appointed to take charge of the royal lands and escheats for a group of counties. This reform both reduced the numbers of local officials and, through the stewards, created a new degree of centralised control as further powers were granted to the

³⁵Ibid., p. 19.

³⁶Ibid., p. 20.

³⁷Ibid., p. 21.

stewards over the next few years³⁸. However, the use of stewards was abandoned in 1283 and the two escheatorships north and south of the Trent were re-established³⁹.

Major changes in the shrieval office came in the Autumn of 1278. Legal developments during the early years of Edward's reign, i.e. the use of the plaint, the petition delivered in parliament and commissions of oyer and terminer provided for a better means of supervising the behaviour of sheriffs⁴⁰. In the Autumn of 1278 a widespread change of sheriffs occurred, 21 in total, with the incoming sheriffs being knights from their own counties: *'Eodem anno amovit rex omnes vicecomites Angliae, clericos scilicet et extraneos, et substituit loco eorum milites de propriis comitatibus'* (Annals of Dunstable)⁴¹. The use of local men as sheriffs thus looked back to the demands and reforms of 1258. This change was to prove permanent⁴².

The concept of change and development in the administration of government is perhaps best demonstrated in the area of crown income. What is clear from the latter years of the Henry's reign is how constrained the monarch was by the 'ordinary' financial resources available to the crown. Although Henry had been able to save a small gold treasure during the 1250s, the crown's resources were only just about sufficient to

³⁸Ibid., pp. 21-22.

³⁹Ibid., p. 23.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 23-26.

⁴¹*Annales Monastici*, vol. III, ed. H. R. Luard (London, 1866), p. 279; Maddicott, 'Edward I and the Lessons of Baronial Reform', p. 26.

⁴²Maddicott, 'Edward I and the Lessons of Baronial Reform', p. 27

cover the king's day to day expenses and were certainly not enough to fund large scale ventures such as warfare. For example, Henry's most ambitious project of the mid 1250s, that of his attempts to get the Sicilian throne for his son Edmund, had to be financed through large taxation of the church and even then it got nowhere. Thus, without recourse to general taxation, the English crown, by the last quarter of the thirteenth century, was limited in what it could spend money upon. The development of a regular supply of income from other sources was needed if the monarch was to pursue any form of sustained warfare. This development duly came about during the course of Edward's reign as a result of the huge sums of money needed to fund his various Welsh and Scottish campaigns. The Welsh campaign of 1282-3 and the associated castle building costs up to 1284 totalled around £120,000⁴³. When this figure is set against the exchequer's estimate of revenue from 'ordinary' sources of income for 1284 of approximately £27,000, Edward's need to find other sources of finance for his warfare is clearly demonstrated. The major area of income for Edward was eventually to be direct taxation. Initially, taxation on the laity was light for the first half of the reign with only two levies of direct taxation up to 1290⁴⁴. Following that date, taxation became much heavier with seven extraordinary lay taxation subsidies being levied in the last 17 years of the reign. These lay taxes, along with six taxes levied on the clergy, a feudal

⁴³Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 200.

⁴⁴W. M. Ormrod, 'State Building and State Finance in the Reign of Edward I', *England in the Thirteenth Century. Proceedings of the 1989 Harlaxton Symposium* (Stamford, 1991), p. 17.

aid and a tallage, yielded around £660,000 for Edward between 1290-1307⁴⁵. Edward's use of direct taxation was not new, and the administration of the subsidies on the laity was similar to those lay taxes raised earlier in the century in 1207, 1225, 1232 and 1237⁴⁶. What was novel was the increased frequency of such taxation after 1290, especially when compared to the absence of direct taxation in the second half of Henry III's reign.

Aside from taxation, two other major financial resources were developed under Edward, these being customs revenue and the use of credit facilities provided by Italian merchants. The use of these two resources can be seen to have had their beginnings in the reign of Henry III. Customs duties had been established by John, though his two experiments in this revenue raising activity were short-lived⁴⁷. Although Henry III does not appear to have received an income from customs duties, he granted to Edward, in February 1266, control over foreign merchants dwelling and trading in England⁴⁸. This grant was followed, two months later in April, by Henry's ratification of Edward's agreements with foreign merchants whereby Edward could '*take a reasonable portion on imports and exports whereby merchants will not be grieved immoderately*'⁴⁹. Edward's collection and administration of these duties was neither

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 17-19.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 19.

⁴⁷R. W. Kauper, *Bankers to the Crown: The Riccardi of Lucca and Edward I* (Princeton, 1973), p. 135.

⁴⁸CPR, 1258-66, p. 551.

⁴⁹CPR, 1258-66, pp. 575-6.

continuous nor standard for the remainder of his father's reign. Edward soon farmed out the customs to Florentine merchants for 6000m a year, though opposition to the duties from both within and outside the realm led to Henry III suspending the custom for a while in May 1267⁵⁰. Three years later, the customs were renewed and, as before, farmed out to Florentine merchants⁵¹. The permanent establishment of customs duties dates from 1275, following a grant in parliament, with rates of 6s 8d on a sack of wool and 13s 4d on every last of hides exported⁵², producing receipts varying from £8,100 in 1279-80 to £12,900 in 1291-2⁵³. The importance of the customs as a non-taxation form of revenue to Edward is partly demonstrated by the 1284 exchequer estimate of revenue where the £8000 given for customs receipts was equivalent to about 30 per cent of the £27,000 revenue estimated for that year⁵⁴.

One of the most important financial developments in Edward I's reign was his use of Italian bankers to provide funds for his wars. The Riccardi of Lucca were the most notable group of these bankers and the finances that they provided for Edward between 1272-94 were essential to his successes of that period⁵⁵. The Riccardi had been operating in England prior to Edward's

⁵⁰Kauper, *Bankers to the Crown*, pp. 136-7.

⁵¹Kauper, *Bankers to the Crown*, p. 137; *CPR, 1266-72*, p. 442.

⁵²M. Prestwich, *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, 1972), pp. 195-96; Kauper, *Bankers to the Crown*, pp. 141, 147.

⁵³Prestwich, *War, Politics*, p. 196.

⁵⁴Mills, 'Exchequer Agenda', pp. 233-4.

⁵⁵Kauper, *Bankers to the Crown*, p. viii.

reign as royal records from the 1240s note business operations by merchants of Lucca⁵⁶. Luke of Lucca, one of the leading figures in the Riccardi firm's relationship with Edward I, had previously done business with Henry III⁵⁷. For example, the *Liberate Rolls*, for July 1269, record a writ authorising the exchequer to give Luke and his fellow merchants £160 to pay for jewels pledged with them for wardrobe necessities⁵⁸. There are other cases, such as the king buying goods off Luke in June 1262 or receiving loans from Luke and others such as in May 1263 for 210m⁵⁹. Most notably there is a case from December 1269 which suggests that Henry was using the Riccardi in a manner that became established during Edward I's reign. The *Patent Rolls* for this month state that the king acknowledged that he was bound to merchants of Ypres for sums of £640 13s 4d and £1030 17s 4d for goods taken from them for the wardrobe. Writs of *liberate* were deposited at the exchequer of receipt ordering the proceeds of the next eyre in four counties to be paid to these merchants for the above debts and '*not applied to any other uses*'. However, this entry was followed by a statement that the letters concerned with the above had been cancelled because the merchants had received £1000 by '*the hand of Luke of Luka for all the said debts*'⁶⁰. What is possibly implied here is that Henry was using Italian bankers to help cover his household expenses, thus foreshadowing the

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 5-6.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 77.

⁵⁸CLR, 1267-72, p. 88.

⁵⁹CPR, 1258-66, pp. 218, 258.

⁶⁰CPR, 1266-72, p. 398.

situation under Edward I when the Riccardi financed virtually all the operations of the wardrobe⁶¹.

These three sources of revenue - taxation, customs and credit facilities - were thus not totally novel developments under Edward. Each of them had been used previously in the century, though in limited ways. Edward just extend the scope and frequency of use. It is perhaps notable that all three income areas were tried in Henry III's reign at a time when Edward was close to the heart of government, i.e. after the Battle of Evesham. It has already been shown how important the ecclesiastical taxation of the late 1260s and the role played by Italian merchants in providing money to the crown was to Henry III's finances of that time. In all these respects, therefore, the final years of the reign of Henry III provided important precedents for the ways in which Edward I placed royal finance on a new footing.

In conclusion, the period 1255-70 appears to be a critical turning point for the finances of the English medieval monarchy. The traditional forms of revenue developed by the Angevin monarchs were no longer sufficient to adequately fund the crown and this is vividly demonstrated by the financial history of 1255-70 when 'extraordinary' costs, such as those of the attempted Sicilian crusade and of the civil war, could only be funded through recourse to large scale taxation. Although this period did not see any full scale attempt at changing the structure of the crown's financial administration or the source of its income,

⁶¹Kauper, *Bankers to the Crown*, pp. 96-100.

the beginnings of the changes that Edward I introduced can be seen and it is this that marks the importance of these years.

Bibliography

Unprinted Primary Sources

- C 60 fine rolls
- C 62 liberate rolls
- E 101 exchequer king's remembrancer, accounts, various
- E 159 memoranda rolls, king's remembrancer
- E 361 wardrobe miscellaneous
- E 368 memoranda rolls, lord treasurer's remembrancer
- E 370 exchequer miscellaneous
- E 371 originalia rolls
- E 372 pipe rolls
- E 401 receipt rolls of the lower exchequer
- E 403 issue rolls of the lower exchequer

Printed Primary Sources

Annales Monastici, ed. H. R. Luard, 5 vols., Rolls Series (London, 1864-9).

Calendar of Charter Rolls, Henry III, 1226-1300 (London, HMSO, 1903-6)

Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous, 1219-1307 (London, HMSO, 1916).

Calendar of Liberate Rolls, Henry III, 1226-1272 (London, HMSO, 1916-64).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Henry III, 1247-1272 (London, HMSO, 1908-1913).

Chronica Johannis de Oxenedes, ed. H. Ellis, Rolls Series (London, 1859).

The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmund 1212-1301, ed. A. Gransden (London, 1964).

Close Rolls 1254-1272 Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III 1254-1272 (London, HMSO, 1931-8).

Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion 1258-1267, ed. R. F. Treharne and I. J. Saunders (Oxford, 1973).

R. FitzNigel, *Dialogus de Scaccario The Course of the Exchequer*, ed. and tran. C. Johnson (Oxford, 1983).

Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae et cujuscunque generis Acta Publica, ed. T. Rymer, vol. I, pt i (Record Commission, 1816).

Gervase The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., Rolls Series (London, 1879-80).

Hersey, A. H. , *An introduction to and an edition of the Hugh Bigod Eyre Rolls, June 1258-February 1259: PRO JUST 1/1187 and JUST 1/873* (Univ. of London PhD thesis, 1991).

Liber Rubeus de Scaccario, ed. H. Hall, 3 vols., Rolls Series (London, 1896).

The Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, ed. W. A. Wright, 2 vols., Rolls Series (London, 1887).

Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, vol. 5, Rolls Series (London, 1880).

Matthew Paris, *English History From the Year 1235 to 1273*, trans. J. A. Giles, vol. 3 (London, 1854).

Matthew Paris, *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard, vol. 2, Rolls Series (London, 1890).

Pipe Roll 1230 The Great Roll of the Pipe for the fourteenth year of the reign of King Henry III Michaelmas 1230, ed. C. Robinson (Pipe Roll Soc. , new ser. , iv, 1927).

The Roll and Writ File of the Berkshire Eyre of 1248, ed. M. T. Clanchy (Selden Society, 1973).

Secondary Sources

The following abbreviations are used:

<i>BIHR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</i>
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>TRHS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>
<i>Thirteenth Century</i>	<i>Thirteenth Century England I: Proceedings of the Newcastle upon Tyne Conference 1985</i> , ed. P. R. Coss and S. D. Lloyd (Woodbridge, 1986)
<i>England I</i>	

Barratt, N. , forthcoming Univ. of London PhD thesis.

Bolton, J. L. , *The Medieval English Economy 1150-1500* (London, 1980).

- Carpenter, D. A. , 'The decline of the curial sheriff in England, 1194-1258', *EHR*, xci (1976), pp. 1-32.
- Carpenter, D. A. , 'What happened in 1258?', *War and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of J. O. Prestwich*, ed. J. Gillingham and J. C. Holt (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 106-119.
- Carpenter, D. A. , 'Kings, Magnates and society: the personal rule of King Henry III, 1234-1258', *Speculum*, lx (1985), pp. 39-70.
- Carpenter, D. A. , 'The Gold Treasure of King Henry III', *Thirteenth Century England I*:
- Carpenter, D. A. , *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990).
- Carpenter, D. A. , 'Simon de Montfort: The First Leader of a Political Movement in English History', *History*, lxxvi (1991).
- Coss, P. R. , 'Sir Geoffrey de Langley and the Crisis of the Knightly Class in Thirteenth Century England', *Past and Present*, lxxiii (1975), 3-37.
- Crook, D. , *Records of the General Eyre*, Public Record Office Handbooks 20 (London, 1982).
- Green, J. A. , 'Praeclarum et Magnificum Antiquitatis Monumentum': the earliest Surviving Pipe Roll', *BIHR*, lv (1982).
- Harris, B. E. , 'King John and the Sheriffs' Farms', *EHR*, lxxix (1964).
- Harvey, P. D. A. , 'The English Inflation of 1180-1220', *Past and Present*, lxi (November 1973).
- Howell, M. , *Regalian Right in Medieval England* (London, 1962).
- Jacob, E. F. , *Studies in the Period of Baronial Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267* (Oxford, 1925).
- Kauper, K. W. , *Bankers to the Crown: The Riccardi of Lucca and Edward I* (Princetown, 1973).
- Knowles, C. H. , 'The Resettlement of England After the Barons War, 1264-67', *TRHS*, xxxii (1982).

- Lunt, W. E. , *Financial Relations of the Papacy with England to 1327* (Cambridge, Mass. , 1939).
- Maddicott, J. R. , 'Edward I and the lessons of Baronial Reform: Local Government, 1258-80', *Thirteenth Century England I*.
- Maddicott, J. R. , 'Magna Carta and the local community 1215-1259' *Past and Present*, cii (1984).
- Maddicott, J. R. , *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Miller, E. and Hatcher, J. , *Medieval England: Rural Society and Economic Change 1086-1348* (London, 1978).
- Mills, M. H. , 'Adventus Vicecomitum, 1258-1272', *EHR*, xxxvi (1921), 481-96.
- Mills, M. H. , 'Exchequer Agenda and Estimate of Revenue, Easter Term 1284', *EHR*, xl (1925).
- Mitchell, S. K. , *Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III* (New Haven, 1914).
- Mitchell, S. K. , *Taxation in Medieval England* (Yale, 1951).
- Morris. W. A. , *The Medieval English Sheriff to 1300* (Manchester, 1927).
- Ormrod, W. M. , 'State Building and State Finance in the Reign of Edward I', *England in the Thirteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1989 Harlaxton Symposium* (Stanford, 1991).
- Prestwich, M. , *Edward I* (London, 1988).
- Prestwich, M. , *War, Politics and Finance under Edward I* (London, 1972).
- Ramsay, J. H. , *The Dawn of the Constitution, 1216-1307* (London, 1908).
- Ramsay, J. H. , *A History of the Revenues of the Kings of England, 1066-1399*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1925).

Ridgeway, H. W. , 'Foreign Favourites and Henry III's Problems of Patronage, 1247-1258', *EHR*, civ (1989).

Stacey, R. C. , *Politics, Policy and Finance under Henry III 1216-1245* (Oxford, 1987).

Stacey, R. C. , '1240-60: A Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations?' *Historical Research*, lxi (1988).

Tout, T. F. , *Chapters in the Administrative History of Mediaeval England*, 6 vols. (Manchester, 1920-33).

Treharne, R. F. , 'The Knights in the period of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-67'. *BIHR*, xxi (1946), 1-12.

Treharne, R. F. , *The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258-1263* (Manchester, 1971).

Whitwell, R. J. , 'The revenue and expenditure of England under Henry III', *EHR*, xviii (1903), 710-11.

